LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH — R. P. D.

U.S.S.R. AND BRITAIN — D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P.

THREE POWER CONFERENCE — Quæstor

DISQUIET ON THE HOME FRONT — J. R. Campbell

INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT AFTER THE WAR — M. H. Dobb

THE FAMILIES OF THE KAYYUR HEROES — N. M. Joshi

BOOK REVIEWS

TWENTY-SIX YEARS

6D

NOVEMBER 1943

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXV. No. 11

CONTENTS

November, 1943

	Page
Notes of the Month—*Twenty-six Years* by R.P.D.	321
U.S.S.R. and Britain by D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.	330
Three-Power Conference by QUAESTOR	335
Disquiet on the Home Front by J. R. CAMPBELL	342
Industry and Employment after the War by M. H. DOBB	345
The Families of the Kayyur Heroes by N. M. JOSHI (*General Secretary, All-India Trades Union Congress*)	350
Book Reviews—	
The Future of Germany by G. R. SANDISON	351
China Advancing by E. S.	351

FIRST IN THE FIELD

Now that others are beginning to call for the setting up of discussion groups, in factories and elsewhere, as the problems of the war and after-the war accumulate; now that in new quarters their importance is being recognized, it is worth while to remind our readers of two things. First, the LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Groups, being first in the field, have in the last four years had some experience and have been able to work out methods for the conduct of such groups. Second, having the regular issue of the magazine as the basis on which they foregathered, the content of their discussing were not and are not haphazard. These facts are also reasons for our readers to help build LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Groups.

LABOUR MONTHLY PAMPHLETS:

THERE ARE NO ARYANS by R. Page Arnot. **6**d. (**Post 1**d.)
PAKISTAN AND INDIAN NATIONAL UNITY by G. M. Adhikari. **6**d. (Post **1**d.)
PATRIOTS OF FRANCE. **2**d. (Post **1**d.)
THE WAR COMES FIRST. **9**d. (Post **2**d.)

Orders of 1/- and over Post Free.

Write for complete list of L.M. Publications to :—

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months **7**s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s. Two weeks' notice is required for change of address.

PRODUCED 2009 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Twenty-six Years—From 1917 to 1943—Socialism Victorious—Height of the Battle—Bolshevism and the West—Before and After 1917—Alliance for Victory—Tributes from Friend and Foe—Soviet War Achievement—From the First to the Second World War—Precious Blood—Sacrifices and Casualties—Shameful Arguments—"Now is the Right Moment"—Political Danger Signals—Sharpening the Fight—Consolidating the Alliance—Three Power Conference—Choice Before Us—Historical Turning Point—Perspective for Socialism—Our Responsibility.

TWENTY-SIX years ago the victory of the Russian Socialist revolution opened a new era of world history. To-day the great Socialist Power which has been built up and grown to maturity during these twenty-six years is victoriously fighting in the forefront of the battle for freedom of all mankind, in the most titanic war in history, as the powerful ally and strongest champion of all the progressive forces of the world, against the worst enemy of human freedom, progress and civilisation, Fascism. This is the profound development which these twenty-six years have brought, itself the prelude to still vaster changes.

THE world battle of 1943 is the direct descendant of 1917. All the forces of destruction and barbarism of the old dying social order have found their ultimate expression in Fascism. Fascism has revealed to a horrified world the final abyss to which reaction, passivity, division and evasion of necessary social change would bring mankind. But the same twenty-six years which have engendered Fascism have also brought to maturity its master, the new socialist civilisation, the representative of all that is creative and constructive, of social liberation and the mastery of the productive forces, of culture and science freed from all fetters, of the classless society of the future. In the face of the menace of Fascism, all the progressive forces of the world have aligned themselves with Socialism. Fascism revealed the terrible and ruthless power of fully unleashed reaction, which tramples down every human right and the existence of nations. But this formidable power of Fascism, which destroyed State after State of the old society, before which French democracy went down in a few weeks, against which even the British and American democracies, with their vast world resources, found themselves powerless to inflict a dent, is now beginning to receive its mortal deathblows at the hands of the armies of the Socialist Power, fighting in alliance with the older democracies. In the final ordeal of battle Socialism is proving stronger than Fascism. Thereby the future of world history is being decided. Bolshevism, which was so long falsely denounced as the enemy of mankind, is to-day proved in the sight of all the saviour of mankind. There is not a man or woman who loves freedom in any country in the world to-day who has not cause to give thanks on this anniversary for November 17, 1917.

THIS world battle now reaches its height. It is not yet decided; the greatest decisions lie before us. Not only the military defeat of Fascism, but the shape of the world to follow that defeat is being determined by our decisions and actions to-day in fulfilment of the alliance. The relations of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union constitute the key to the next stage of world history. Failure of the peoples of the West to grasp that key a quarter of a century ago; weakness and illusions of the labour and democratic movement; and consequent conflict and divisions made possible the victory of reaction in the West and gave birth to Fascism. Now the common struggle against Fascism has given us a renewed opportunity under new condi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions. The consolidation of the alliance in action is not only the condition of military victory over Fascism, but opens the way to world collaboration and new democratic advance in the future. The alternative would mean an even bloodier chaos than the past twenty-six years have known, making more painful and delayed the ultimate advance to socialism.

THIS is the issue which underlies the pivotal present question of effective common military action, the question of the Second Front, and which underlies all the proceedings of the Three-Power Conference. The British people, and in the forefront the British working-class movement, has here the most responsible part to play, decisive equally for the future in this country and in the world. We need to fight with all our power for the strengthening of the alliance, for the Second Front, and for the democratic settlement of all the world-issues arising from the war. This is the essential immediate task before all socialists to-day. It is a task, not only for Socialists, but for all supporters of progress. The greatest responsibility rests on all democrats at this great turning-point: equally on those who, while not Socialists, stand for world co-operation and democratic advance; and on those who, while directing all their endeavours to the speediest transition from capitalist to socialist society, understand, as Marx and Lenin always insisted, that this transition takes place, not in one simplified confrontation of a conscious socialist section against a single reactionary mass, but through a prolonged cycle of the most varied and complex social struggles, wars and transformations, in which the ultimate victory of Socialism depends on the effective unity in action at each stage of the most varied social forces.

THE question of Socialism has long been settled in principle for our epoch; and the old controversies bear to-day an old-fashioned flavour, rendered the more piquant when some Liberal Rip Van Winkle belatedly discovers America and triumphantly founds a new sect to put the world right. The transition of Socialism from theory to practice has been accomplished in the Soviet Union; and the proof of the practice has been completed, and reached its final verification in the sternest test of war. The whole record of our epoch has deomonstrated the bankruptcy of the old capitalist society, and the urgent necessity of the transition to Socialism. But the question of Socialism has still to be settled in action in the rest of the world. The question of Socialism is not only a question of criticism of the old society or demonstration of the necessity of the new: it is a question of power. Ability to grasp and solve the problems of power has been the strength of Bolshevism. Inability to understand or solve the problems of power has been the besetting weakness of the so-called "Western school of Socialism" (Fabian, reformist or social-democratic theories).

PRIOR to 1917 the questions of power developed mainly within each country on the basis of the confrontation of the working-class and its allies against the ruling class forces within each country, with a general bond of international working-class solidarity and collaboration against the mutual aid of world reaction. But since 1917 the question of power, while not losing its elementary basis within each country, has developed primarily on a world plane to a very much higher degree and in fundamentally new forms than previously. From the moment that Socialism won state power in a leading country, in a country constituting one of the Great Powers, *from that moment the question of power, decisive for the future of Socialism, has become a question of world relations of power, of "world power-politics," indissolubly linked up with the class relations of power within each country.* This is the elementary basis of Socialist politics in our era, in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

era of the world Socialist revolution, that is, since 1917.

HENCE the naive, obsolete and even viciously reactionary delusions of those "Socialist" survivals who still try to present the issues in pre-1917 terms, and piteously complain that the question of Socialism has become "distorted" by "power-politics" or "subordinated to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." Thereby these reformists only show again their congenital incapacity to face the problems of power, just as they did a quarter of a century ago, when they denounced the Bolshevik Revolution. But, despite all such confusions and theoretical mystifications and "left Socialist" denunciations, familiar since 1917, the mass instinct of the working-class in all countries has shown again and again in action, from 1917 to the present day, its practical understanding of the basic identity of interests of the working-class struggle in each country with the Soviet Union. This is the sure premiss of future victory. This alignment reaches a new significance in and through the battlefront of the United Nations for the defeat of Fascism, and in the far-reaching world issues before the Three-Power Conference.

WHEN Mr. Churchill declared in his Quebec broadcast at the end of August:—

No Government ever formed among men has been capable of surviving injuries so grave and cruel as those inflicted by Hitler upon Russia. . . . Russia has not only survived and recovered from those frightful injuries, but has inflicted as no other force in the world could have inflicted, mortal damage on the German army machine.

that tribute to the strength of the new society and State as revealing a new power and vitality never before known among men is the more significant, precisely because it came from a Conservative Prime Minister; from one who in the years following 1917 had sought by every means of arms and conspiracy, of invasion and subsidised plotting to strangle the infant Soviet Republic; who had spent his political lifetime in proclaiming from every platform the inefficiency and incompetence of Socialism; and who, even as late as 1940, was still proclaiming the "military incapacity of the Red Army and the Red Air Force." The relentless force of facts shatters the illusions of twenty-six years. The leader of the old society pays tribute to the superior strength of the new.

WHEN the Government Minister, Lord Selborne, declared on October 15:—

Germany has lost on the field of battle more than twice as many men as in the whole of the last war. Nine-tenths of them have been lost in Russia.
—(Lord Selborne, Minister of Economic Warfare, speech at Gosport, October 15, 1943.)

it is worth reflecting on the significance of this fact, and on the basic change in the relation of forces revealed since the first world war. In the first world war Germany engaged 85 divisions against Tsarist Russia, or slightly over one-third of its total forces, and, together with its allies, 126 divisions, as against 135 divisions on the Western Front. In the second world war, between 1939 and 1941, the Soviet Union, while neutral, held immobilised 85 Nazi divisions on the Eastern frontier of Germany and the Soviet Union. That is to say, the Socialist Soviet Union, while neutral, pinned down as many German divisions as Tsarist Russia, exerting all its forces in full and costly war, proved unable to hold. The Soviet Union, while neutral, pinned down many times more Nazi divisions than the British Empire and the United States have yet engaged throughout the war, and actually more divisions than it is now urged that the British Empire and the United States should draw off to the West by the Second Front. This fact is worth remembering when Munichite poetasters, after rejecting the Soviet offer of alliance against Hitler, subsequently have the insolence to boast of the consequent isolation of this country ("In 1940, when we bore the brunt, we could have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done, boys, with a Second Front."). In fact, the Second Front demand, which after four and a half years of preparation and two and a half years of alliance still appears to be found such a formidable task, is equivalent to the proposal that the British Empire and the United States, *as allies*, should draw off less divisions to the West than the Soviet Union, *as a neutral*, held in the East during the preceding period.

WITH the full development of the second world war, the Soviet Union has engaged 147 Nazi divisions in the summer of 1941; 179 Nazi divisions in the summer of 1942; and now 212 Nazi divisions in the autumn of 1943, or, with the satellite forces, 240 divisions in all. This total on a single front, engaged by the Soviet Union in isolation, is equivalent to nearly double the total German forces on the Western Front in the last war, engaged by Britain, France and the United States in combination. It is not far off the combined total of the entire forces of the Quadruple Alliance in the last war (261 divisions) engaged on every front against the entire combined strength of Britain, France, Italy, Russia, Japan, the United States and other States. Overwhelming as were the casualties inflicted on the old Kaiser-Germany by this many-fronted world alliance in the first world war, twice as many casualties have been inflicted in the second war; but this time nine-tenths of the casualties have been inflicted by the Soviet Union alone, and only one-tenth by the other partners.

THE contrast is indeed striking between the two world wars. In two and a quarter years of fighting the Soviet Union has inflicted upon Nazi Germany, representing a much more formidable mechanised and armed power than the old Kaiser-Germany, nearly twice as many casualties as were inflicted on the old Kaiser-Germany in four and a quarter years by the entire alliance of Britain, France, Tsarist Russia, Italy, Japan and the United States. Such is the stupendous scale of the second world war, whose magnitude is still inadequately realised in this country, partly because it is being fought by this country at a much lower level than the last war. Such is the stupendous scale of the achievement of the Soviet Union, demonstrating the superior strength, economic, political and moral, as Engels long ago foretold, of Socialist organisation, heroism, sacrifice and fighting will in the ultimate test of war, when forced upon it by the assault of reaction from the old world. This demonstration in war has compelled universal recognition, from friend and foe alike, breaking through the web of lies and propaganda myths, which lose their currency in the grim weighing-scales of war, of the magnitude of the transformation from the old weak and enfeebled Tsarism to the modern Socialist Power. This demonstration points the way no less unmistakably, in the sight of all, to the consequent basic transformation in the world relations of power, of profound and deepening significance for the future. Hence the importance, at this turning-point, of the issues which now come up for decision at the Three-Power Conference, and the vital urgency of promoting a positive outcome of this Conference.

THIS achievement has not been possible without heavy cost. It has not been possible without heavy sacrifice in blood and privation; in the destruction of Socialist towns, factories, cultural monuments and prized achievements of a generation of Socialist construction; in the barbaric enslavement, massacres and oppression of scores of millions of Soviet citizens at the hands of the Fascist invader; and, above all, in the sacrifice of the most precious treasure of world humanity to-day, of millions of lives of the new Socialist youth, born and bred under the conditions of Socialism, than whom any

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other lives anywhere in the world could have been more easily spared. In the height of their vitality and creative power, representatives of a new civilisation, they have had to go to their death, with the loss to the world of all they could have achieved, in order to destroy the Fascist brutes, the filth and scum whose counterparts they had never allowed to grow up in their own land, but whom they had to give their lives to overcome, solely because the working-class movements and the peoples of the other countries had been too weak and ill-led to win their own battle for power and had proved incapable of preventing the growth of Fascism. This thought can never be absent for a moment from the consciousness of serious Socialists and workers in the countries outside the Soviet Union.

THERE has been much talk of sacrifices and casualties in the current controversy on the Second Front. The Munichites and opponents of the Second Front have argued that the strategy of the Second Front would entail the risk of sacrifices and casualties. They have praised the strategy of Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt, or celebrated the alternative strategy of air bombing, on the grounds that it means economy in human lives:—

A marvellous economy of life. The last war cost the British Empire 1,089,919 men, killed and 2,400,988 wounded. The first four years of this war have cost us 92,089 men killed and 315,013 wounded, apart from the civilian victims of the blitz. And Germany once more is reeling.

—(*Observer* editorial, "Fifth Year," August 29, 1943.)

Our theory has been to keep down casualties and to provide our forces with the best equipment —overwhelming equipment—in the belief that metal is cheaper than men.

—(Mr. Bevin's speech to the Trades Union Congress, September 7, 1943.)

Sir Philip dwelt upon the immense saving in British man-power to be achieved by bombing Germany instead of using land forces in Europe. He argued that we could bomb Berlin on a large scale 200 times without losing so many men as we lost in one day's fighting on the Somme in the last war.

—(Air-Marshal Sir Philip Joubert, B.B.C. War Commentary, Sept. 30, 1943—press report.)

When this war is over and the historian takes charge of the situation, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt will be granted a prominent place for one particular thing they did. It will be said of these two leaders that they were sparing of the blood of their peoples.

—(Augur in the *Yorkshire Evening News*, October 1, 1943.)

IT would be better that these arguments should not be used. It would be better that those who use them should show some sense of proportion and some sense of shame. Nine-tenths of the casualties of Nazi Germany, which have in truth sent Germany "reeling" and brought in view the prospect of victory for all the allied nations, have been inflicted by the Soviet forces. According to the official Soviet statement, the total of Soviet military losses, killed or taken prisoner (very few taken prisoner), at the end of two years of war was 4,200,000. This was before the Nazi summer offensive, and the gigantic Soviet offensive of the past three months. The consequent figure now can hardly be less than 5,000,000 and possibly more—apart from the very heavy civilian losses. According to Mr. Attlee's statement on June 1, 1943, the total of British Empire casualties after three years of war was 92,089 killed, 226,719 missing and 107,891 prisoners. According to the American official statement issued in October, 1943, the total American casualties to date, for the first twenty-two months of war, was 22,892 dead, 32,912 missing and 25,483 prisoners. The Soviet people and spokesmen have never to this date made public contrast of these figures. It is not for the Munichites and opponents of the Second Front to begin to speak of them, still less to gloat over them. They cannot be aware how such arguments must look in the eyes of the world, or in the eyes of the Jugoslav, Greek, French or other European peoples' guerilla fighters, whose dead alone will exceed these totals of the Anglo-American contribution to date. Such arguments for the refusal of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second Front recall too closely the most shameful memories of Munich, when a Chamberlain could brandish before the frenzied mob of his Tory supporters the illusory promises of peace with dishonour —with the results since known. Were such arguments to win currency, it would bespeak a degree of degeneration which is in fact a foul libel on the British and American peoples.

BUT, in fact, the strategy of the Second Front is not the strategy of more, but of less casualties in the ultimate cost of the war. The argument of principle does not diverge from the practical argument, but coincides with it. What was true of Munich is even more true to-day, that the policy of the avoidance of the fight, or delay of the fight, in the name of the fear of the possible costs, in the end costs most. Because the strategy of the Second Front is by universal admission the strategy for speedy victory, it is also the strategy which means the minimum cost in lives, not only for the whole alliance, for the Soviet people and the enslaved European peoples, but also for the British and American peoples. Delay of the maximum combined action in the moment of the crisis of Fascism means time for Hitler to rally his forces; to prepare his defensive strategy on the basis of the inner fortress of Europe; to strengthen his fortifications with concrete and steel, which will have to be finally stormed at the cost of British and American lives; to complete the training of the new reserves combed out by the super-mobilisation of the earlier part of this year. The declaration of Sir Stafford Cripps on September 26 spoke the truth:—

Blows struck heavily at the right moment may be decisive in ending the war; and now is the right moment. To falter at this stage is to impose a fresh sacrifice of life upon the soldiers, sailors and airmen of the United Nations.

But this note has not been echoed in the statements of other Government Ministers. The statements of other Government Ministers have sounded a very different note, and have thus spread confusion among the people.

MORE. Delay does not only mean the loss of military opportunities, and thus raise the ultimate military cost. Delay raises political dangers. Delay gives time for the disruptive political forces to get to work to undermine the present favourable military situation. Strategy can never be separated from politics, least of all in the war against Fascism. The secret of Fascism at every stage of its aggression, and throughout the present war, has consisted in its combination of military and political weapons. Never was this more true than to-day. Precisely because the military situation grows less favourable for Fascism, so its whole strategy becomes to play for time in order to bring political factors into operation. The overwhelming military superiority of the United Nations, provided that military superiority is expressed in effective and full combined action, and provided unity is maintained, can no longer be denied by Fascism. Hence the one hope of Fascism becomes to delay such combined military action and to split the political unity of the alliance so as to lead to a new balance of forces. This becomes the last stage of the struggle. The moral is clear. We must defeat this final strategy of Fascism on both counts, both by speeding combined military action, that is, by the Second Front, and by strengthening the political unity of the alliance. As the military situation grows more favourable, so the urgency of the issues becomes greater and not less. The Three-Power Conference becomes the decisive conference of the war.

THE common man's view (encouraged by all the manifold agencies of semi-official and press propaganda, as well as within the labour movement, which seek to lull and chloroform the war effort and to deaden political initiative) that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"the war goes well," that the military situation is favourable, and that the prospect of final victory draws close, is not in itself incorrect. The situation was never more favourable. The alternative official counter-propaganda, which seeks to dwell on the strength of Fascism and present gloomy prognostications of a prolonged war for years ahead, is only the other side of the medal, and represents the cover for the policy of refusal to utilise the present favourable situation. What is incorrect is the failure to draw the positive practical conclusion for action from this situation; the easy-going assumption that the working-class and and democratic movement can relax its attention from the issues of the war, can be satisfied with passivity and "trusting the authorities to finish the job," or switch the main attention to domestic questions and post-war questions as an alternative to the urgent issues of war policy, in place of seeing all these in their unity. The favourable situation makes the fight sharper in every sphere, if the people are not to be robbed of victory and of the fruits of victory.

THE increasingly favourable situation for the complete and final victory of the peoples over Fascism inevitably gives rise at the same time to the increased activity of counter-forces which seek to rob the peoples of victory. There is no ground for surprise over such a development, but only for sharpening the fight and the activity of all supporters of the alliance and enemies of Fascism with the greater confidence and determination. As the prospect of the downfall of Fascism draws into view, powerful reactionary forces in Britain and the United States which were less active in the moment of danger from a Fascist military victory now begin to increase their activity. No longer fearing the military victory of Fascism, they now begin to calculate primarily in terms of the new situation consequent on the weakening and prospective downfall of Fascism. They fear the consequences of the downfall of Fascism, they fear speedy joint victory with the Soviet Union, they fear the liberation of the European peoples. Hence they work to retard decisive military action, and to support policies of delay which would promote the exhaustion of the Soviet Union and the European peoples. They construct an elaborate straightjacket apparatus to control the European peoples liberated from Fascism. Open anti-Soviet propaganda comes again prominently into view. They indulge in intrigues with shady reactionary elements in Europe. All this makes necessary increased activity and sharpened fight of the working-class and democratic movement to speed military action, to strengthen the alliance and to strengthen support of the liberation movements of the European peoples. The winning of the Second Front, of full common military action, is not only the essential military necessity, but the decisive answer to all reactionary political intrigues.

THERE can be no under-estimating the gravity of the issues which confront the Three-Power Conference. But there is also no ground for assuming that a positive solution of these issues cannot be reached. Disruption or weakening of the alliance is not in the interests of any of the partners of the alliance, but only of Fascism and the friends of Fascism. We reject and combat the perspective that the alliance must break up in the hour of victory into the opposition of Anglo-American reaction, with its puppets in Europe, on the one side, and the Soviet Union and the Socialist and popular forces in Europe, on the other. This is the perspective of the third world war, which is the favourite weapon of Nazi propaganda (and some elements in the labour movement fall into the trap of this propaganda by presenting a similar per-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spective and thus play into the hands of the pro-Fascist disrupters). Just as the difference in the social and political systems of the States composing the alliance was no obstacle to the original formation of the alliance, so it need be still less an obstacle to the further strengthening of the alliance, the concerting of the military measures for final victory, and the preparation of international collaboration for the maintenance of peace. The political problems within Europe can only be solved on the basis of the democratic liberation of the European peoples held under Nazi rule, and the determination by the peoples themselves of their own future. The first task of the Three Power Conference is to organise victory, to tackle the problem of a unified strategy and concert the military measures for the speediest defeat of Fascism and ending of the war. The accomplishment of that task is the central pivot for the solution of all other problems, for strengthening the support of the liberation movements of the European peoples and ensuring their democratic liberation, and for building the basis of international co-operation after the war.

HOW far will the Three-Power Conference be able to accomplish these tasks? This depends, not only on the negotiations of the diplomatists, statesmen and military experts gathered in Moscow, but, above all, on the pressure of public opinion in this country and the United States. General Smuts' speech at the Guildhall on October 19 is a warning signal of the mobilisation of opposition forces. On the day of the opening of the Conference the Premier of South Africa took it upon himself to lay down as if it were a settled issue the policy of delay of the Second Front into 1944, at the very moment when the Governments of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union are meeting to discuss the possibility and the urgency of an earlier date. That was no helpful intervention. Such an intervention demonstrates the necessity for a still more powerful intervention by the labour and democratic movement to press forward the action of the Government; to ensure the speedy fulfilment of the alliance and of the pledge of the Second Front, now already seventeen months after the Three Power Declaration of May, 1942, recognising the urgency of the Second Front in 1942; and to strengthen the solidarity of the United Nations for the entire future. Never in all these twenty-six years since 1917 have the issues before us been of greater magnitude for the whole future of the world.

ON our response, decisions and action, on the response, decisions and action of the labour movement and popular forces in this country, depends the future, the character and perspective of the whole coming period for this country and the world. The years which are now opening out with this final phase of the war and its sequel will be even more decisive, and will bring vaster world changes, than the years following 1917. The greatest opportunity since those years following 1917 is now in our hands to mould the future anew, to retrieve past errors, and to ensure that the next quarter of a century shall be very different from the quarter of a century which followed 1917. Achievement of the tasks which now lie before us, through full-scale common military action for the speedy defeat of Fascism, and through the consolidation of the United Nations for the democratic settlement of the peace and for post-war international collaboration, will open the way to the most favourable perspective for the future of democratic and socialist advance throughout the world.

ON this anniversary, which brings before our view the record and the lessons of these twenty-six years in clearer focus than ever before, let the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole working-class movement, let the whole people, awaken to the magnitude of the prospect which now opens out, and whose realisation depends on our present decisions and action. The final destruction of Fascism will mean the lifting of a nightmare which has weighed down the working-class movement and all democratic advance, not only in the countries conquered by Fascism, but in every country. The consolidation of firm and durable democratic collaboration of the United Nations, the fulfilment of the British-Soviet Twenty Years Alliance, the co-operation of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union will open the way to a very different quarter of a century of world history than the last. Within every country the experience of these years has burnt through many illusions. Strongly based and experienced Communist Parties have developed in all countries. Lessons of unity have been deeply driven home. Every economic and political outcome of these years has shown more and more powerfully the necessity of the advance to a new basis of social organisation, of the advance to Socialism. This advance must and will take place, through all conditions, whether more or less favourable, with whatever greater or less conflict and sacrifices. But the opportunity is now within our grasp, through the common victory over Fascism and through carrying forward the initial basis of co-operation established in the United Nations, to establish the most favourable conditions for the speediest and least costly transition of humanity to the new historical epoch. We must seize this opportunity with both hands.

THE realisation of this perspective depends on our present decisions and action. It depends on the present activity and positive leading role of the working-class movement. Without this positive role such a perspective would become only a dream and an illusion, to be replaced by a very different and grim reality of deepening and protracted conflict. Hence our main response to this great anniversary must be a practical one; to intensify our campaign, to strengthen the war effort, to concentrate all for democratic victory over Fascism, to speed the Second Front, and to consolidate the alliance of the United Nations; so that the twenty-seventh year which now opens shall see—as it can see, if we do our part—the complete and final destruction of Fascism, the liberation of the nations enslaved by Fascism, and the establishment of the conditions for the most rapid advance to the future victory of Socialism all over the world.

R. P. D.

October 20, 1943.

? ? HAVE YOU SEEN EUS 5391

"SPANISH VILLAGE"

by Lope de Vega

UNITY THEATRE,

Goldington Street, Pancras Road, N.W.1

(Near Mornington Crescent Station and Kings Cross)

THURSDAYS TO SUNDAYS 7.30

Members only.
Annual membership (minimum) 2/-

SUPPORT THE PEOPLE'S THEATRE OF LONDON

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S.S.R. and Britain

by D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.

THE twenty-sixth year of the new Soviet civilisation draws to its close. Our allies, the pride and hope of workers in all lands, the guarantee of the world's future, have scaled new heights of efficiency, strength, achievement, and heroism. In less than three July weeks they wiped out a powerful and highly concentrated Nazi summer offensive with appalling losses, and before that was even disposed of they launched their own summer offensive, in which they liquidated one "impregnable" fortress after another, drove forward unremittingly hundreds of miles on fronts hundreds of miles wide, and started the gradual break-up of the mightiest armies that aggressors have ever put into the field.

The Red Army has thus conclusively demonstrated its superiority in every department, human and material, and in every season, over enemies who have for ten years devoted the whole effort of a numerous, efficient, and highly organised people to the attempt to establish military domination over the whole world, and for three of those years have exploited, in addition to their own resources the industrial equipment of all Europe and most of its man-power, armed and unarmed. Nor is any injustice done to the remarkable successes achieved by the British and American forces in those campaigns on which they have been allowed to embark, if one adds that in this tremendous year—the year of Stalingrad and of Smolensk, of the Volga and the Dnieper—the 700,000,000 people of whom the British and American leaders sometimes boast have rendered so little aid, direct or indirect, to the Red Army, apart from material supplies, that it has had to engage continuously more than 80 per cent. of all the fighting forces of Germany and her satellites. It is, indeed, true that the allies of the U.S.S.R. have not at any time since June, 1941, kept away from the Eastern Front nearly as many German divisions as the mere existence of the Red Army, before it came into the war, detained on that front.

The immense strength which the Soviet peoples have shown so vividly again and again, and shown this year more clearly than ever in their glorious and bitterly won successes, does not, of course—nor could it—rest on military capacity alone. Industrial strength and flexibility, miracles of organisation, unexampled scientific development, both in the long years of uneasy peace and in the thirty months of actual fighting, were all required to fit the Soviet peoples to meet the mass attacks of the summers of 1941 and 1942, to survive their tremendous losses of industrial plant, and to win their way through atrocity and suffering to their present position of superiority. Nor could any merely material strength have sufficed of itself to steel human beings to the tremendous tasks our allies have faced and surmounted; such tasks needed at every stage the morale and endurance and initiative that could only be displayed by a free and united people, masters of their own destiny and creators of their own Socialist discipline and civilisation.

And the morale and endurance called for by the unparalleled difficulties of this tremendous fight are not merely "front-line qualities"; they have been needed—and have been found—right through from beyond the front to the rear. Westwards, deep behind the German lines, the guerillas fight with resource and courage. In the front line itself, the flower of the Red Army, with its Air Force above it and the Red Navy on its farthest flanks, fights with equal prowess, outmatching the best of Germany's picked troops. The stories of its heroism are endless; let one recent one be quoted, from the accounts given in *The Times* of October 9, of some of the crossings of the wide Dnieper in the teeth of powerful enemies on the high western bank:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There were places where the ardour of the men was so great that they did not wait for pontoons. Clinging to logs, to capes stuffed with hay, and to empty fuel barrels, they swarmed over the Dnieper by daylight, braving attacks by German bombers and low-flying Focke Wulf fighters. One Russian war correspondent, describing the scene, writes that it was the most impressive example of heroism ever witnessed. The river's surface was made rough by bomb and shell explosions. Once he counted nine aircraft attacking a single raft on which four men sought to take a light gun across. These men by thousands landed on unmapped islands of shifting sand, at the foot of granite cliffs, on the muddy banks of the river, and after them came great rafts with 20 men heaving at the tiller and singing songs of the Volga, the Kama, and the Siberian rivers, bringing horses, tanks, ambulances, food, ammunition, and guns.

Then, behind the front, for scores and hundreds of miles, railway and road transport organisations construct, repair, contrive, and improvise, to carry the immense supplies required for modern battle by rail and road over hundreds of miles of scorched earth, over mud or snow, over marsh and plain and river, whilst the most efficient medical services in history cope so well with their problems that 80 per cent. of the wounded are restored to the firing line.

Farther back again, for hundreds and thousands of miles, industry and agriculture solve old and new problems of production and supply in such fashion that the Red Army has reached definite superiority in tanks and planes and artillery over the best and the most that Hitler can use all Europe to produce. One reads of such achievements as a ninefold increase in the production of high quality rolled steel in September, 1943, over June, 1941, or a proposal to build—without even the aid of Mr. Ernest Brown's voice—22,000 new cottages in the Smolensk region alone before the end of 1943, with no more surprise than is evoked by the many accounts of heroism in the front line.

There seems to be no weak link; the "Soviet men of steel . . . the new workers, the new peasants, the new intelligentsia, people whose like has never before been known in the history of mankind"—as *Pravda* has described them—stand firm as a rock against all the tempests. These war years are plainly a heroic age, in which even the epic resistances of Leningrad, Odessa, Moscow, Sevastopol, Stalingrad, great as they are, are no more than outstanding episodes in a mighty saga of heroism; and the pre-war years of Soviet growth will be seen in history as not less heroic but merely less dramatic. The two decades between the wars, that other peoples, politically less enlightened, call "the wasted years," will be known to the Soviet peoples and their children as years of glorious struggle in which they passed from feudal twilight to a full Socialist development, to the threshold of industrial supremacy over even the greatest of capitalist countries, and to the economic and political leadership of the world.

And now, at the end of the twenty-sixth year of the life and growth of the Soviet peoples, in the light of the tremendous qualities they have developed, what practical lessons must we draw about the Soviet people and their state, about the effect on the various countries in Europe of their remarkable growth, and about the repercussions upon ourselves in Britain?

As for the U.S.S.R. herself, the story of her twenty-sixth year, standing on the shoulders of the previous twenty-five (apart from its demonstration of the infinite capacity for development of Socialist economy) surely removes the last excuse for doubt as to her sincerity, her strength, or her determination; all the old fables—the failure of the Five-Year Plans, the appeasement of Hitler, the papier mache tanks and corseted soldiers, the popular longing for an end of the Soviet regime, the millions languishing in concentration camps—have all been exposed as utter falsehoods; the speeches of her leaders ceased to be "enigmas" when it was realised that their only unusual feature is that they say what they mean and mean what they say; and no one has ever had the hardihood to suggest that she is doing less than her utmost in the war. Truly, there *should* be no cross-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

currents in the understanding of or attitude to the Soviet Union in this or any other country.

Not less important is the effect on the various Nazi-occupied and satellite countries in Europe which follows from the shining demonstration that working-class power not merely compasses victory in war but brings at all times unity and freedom and a fuller and happier life for workers and peasants alike—a demonstration which the smoke-screens of reactionary propaganda have worked so hard and long to obscure. It means a reinforcement of the popular forces in those countries that not all the horses and men of King Reaction will ever put their Humpty Dumpty together again. And in Germany itself the effect will be not merely to compel the realisation that Hitler's defeat is inevitable; what is far more important is that here too the source and manner of the defeat will encourage and strengthen —even before defeat is a reality—the forces of the Left, so that the country will not choose for its future either reaction, anarchy, or revenge, but will set itself to building a new Germany, freed for ever of the urge for aggression, and capable of attending to its own re-education and to the work of reparation which it will owe to U.S.S.R. and to the occupied countries.

But it is here in Britain that the repercussions of the repeated and finally conclusive demonstration of the strength of the Soviet Union are most interesting, and at the same time partly disquieting. To the uninformed onlooker, it might seem—let me repeat—that there could be no cross-currents. We live near Hitler, and want an end of him. We have a great labour movement, and an experienced working-class, with long traditions of struggle, whole-heartedly anti-Fascist. We have an eighteen-months-old treaty with the Soviet Union—the closest and most far-reaching alliance for peace-time co-operation that Britain has ever made—which binds each party for at least twenty years "to work together in close and friendly collaboration. . . . for the organisation of security and economic prosperity in Europe"; to come at once to the aid of the other "with all military and other support and assistance in his power" in the event of any attack by Germany or any of her associates in the post-war period; to render the other all possible economic assistance after the war: and not to make any alliance or enter any coalition directed against the other. We have, moreover, been saved from invasion not only by our own remarkable air victories in the Battle of Britain but also, over many long months both before and after June, 1941, by the Red Army. With all this, surely, it might be thought, there will no longer be doubts or hesitations or hostilities here, among us? Surely all of us, and not least those who by merit, or by the accident of birth or shareholding, are entrusted directly or indirectly with the work of Government, realise the importance of the fullest co-operation between ourselves, the U.S.A., and the Soviet Union, in the first great task, still unfinished, of winning the war, and in the longer and equally vital one of establishing the basis of durable peace and progress thereafter?

It is at this point that the simple-minded meet with a surprise and the more astute see their analysis of the situation confirmed. Why are there cross-currents? What are the elements of the position? In Great Britain, nearly all the various and by no means harmonious elements which compose the ruling class want to win the war against Germany, but they want at the same time to preserve the existing economic system and their own power therein. When the military situation is dangerous, they pay—without laying aside their activities in the class conflict—more attention to fighting Hitler, and to the fostering of national unity for that fight. As soon as the position grows easier, a section of them becomes more consciously active in the class conflict, more ready to provoke the workers, to resist reforms, and in any and every other

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way to build up their post-war position. This is the clue to their apparent changes of attitude at different periods of the war; and it is with that clue in mind that their every movement should be studied.

How does that quite natural attitude work out in relation to the Soviet Union? The divisions of the various elements of the ruling class are important here. In the anxious future, close friendship with the Soviet Union in general, and the definite advantages represented by the mutual undertakings in the Twenty Years' Treaty in particular, are recognised by a large section of the ruling class as on the whole clearly beneficial to their own interests as well as to those of the general mass; for the Treaty goes a long way to redress the balance of forces in Britain's favour in the post-war world, it encourages their hopes of securing a substantial share of world-trade, and, above all, it offers the only substantial basis for ending aggression and preventing a third world war. For these elements, accordingly, this alliance with the Soviet Union, and the clear agreement on our aims in Europe expressed in the signature in January, 1942, of the Treaty confirming the Atlantic Charter, present a positive and secure footing for collaboration, which they not merely accept but greatly value.

There remain, however, irreconcilably hostile elements, ready at no matter what risk to the unity of the allies, to an early victory, or even to any victory over Hitler, to spread anti-Soviet poison. We have seen them at work before; we know their minds; and we would know their hearts if they had any.

They are already, at this critical period responsible for innumerable and varied pin-pricks and slanders. Let us examine one example. When one learns that it is one of the functions of the Foreign Office to prepare weekly for the War Office a "Political Review . . . to give army officers a clear and authentic picture of political events," one grows anxious, for these elements are well represented in the Foreign Office. Now, in August, 1943, this Review dealt with the Soviet demand for a Second Front; this is a serious demand, which the Allies have repeatedly promised to fulfil, and the Prime Minister has several times expressed his full understanding of it; indeed, he has recently endorsed the demand fully by saying that the Second Front is potentially in being. In that situation, how does the Foreign Office set about giving army officers a "clear and authentic picture"? Well, it writes in tones of abominable upper class insolence (the sort of insolence, incidentally, which can only flourish in that physical security which the Red Army does so much to provide for us).

This is what it writes (the italics are mine):—

Unfortunately, a Second Front campaign by the Soviet press and radio, more *persistent in its boring monotony* than any previous one, started as long ago as the beginning of July, and has been given *additional stimulus* by the victories at Orel and Byelgorod.

(How dare these Russians win battles, and then suggest we ought to take advantage of them to win the war quickly!)

It has *even* been taken up officially; for the special communique issued by the Soviet Information Bureau, reviewing the course of operations since July 5, *culminated* in the statement that "the successful military operations of the Red Army . . . thus created still more favourable conditions for the development of active offensive operations of our Allies on the Continent of Europe."

Thus does the gentleman in the Foreign Office explain his "boredom"—could he perhaps repair to some lively spot like the Dnieper banks to cure his boredom?—at the Soviet suggestion (written in the blood of hundreds of thousands of the finest of Soviet youth who have died to lay the foundations of a colossal victory over Fascism) that, in the new and favourable circumstances which the Red Army has done so much to create, we might *now* take the step which the Government declares we are ready to take "at the right moment."

And when he has written out his poison, it is carried along to the War

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Office, whose obvious duty it is to burn it at once, rather than to let it be broadcast to officers who ought to be encouraged to real knowledge of their Soviet allies and to friendly feelings towards them. But in this department there is available—in the "right" place—one more adherent of this poison-pen section of the ruling class. He passes it for publication in a "Weekly Intelligence Review," for whose wide distribution special arrangements have been made, in order (says the War Office) to "enable *all officers* to read it . . . and give a far greater number than hitherto the opportunity of gaining information about the enemy, including political aspects and events abroad." It is interesting that, whilst some articles in this Review are marked "For reproduction for the use of other ranks," this particular contribution is not so marked. The sergeant and the private cannot, it seems, be safely trusted with the news that the Soviet demand for a Second Front produces a sensation of ennui in the Foreign Office.

The recent improvement of the military situation has made these elements doubly bold and doubly poisonous. Doubly, because firstly, the improved military situation makes them feel safer in picking their quarrels, and secondly they are obsessed by a sense of urgency and alarm since so large a part of our military successes are brought about by the Red Army.

In such circumstances, the campaign of hostility, underground and not so underground, has sprung up again in great force; every grotesque fable and libel is revived; and since the British public has grown from past experience suspicious of "news" about the Soviet Union, and is, moreover, profoundly stirred and enlightened by the prowess of the Red Army and of the whole Soviet people, the anti-Soviet forces have to resort for help, in the no longer easy task of poisoning the public mind, to the circulation of the wildest rumours. Most of these rumours are best passed over in silence, but one typical one that can be mentioned is the suggestion that when the Red Army has driven the Germans out of Soviet territory it will stop at the frontier—which led a wit to remark that half of Whitehall and the City is afraid that the Red Army will stop at the frontier and the other half is afraid that it won't!

What is our task in this tremendous problem, whose importance it would be impossible to exaggerate? It is not difficult to see what we must do. We are at a stage of the war which is still crucial from a military point of view, and at the same time we are near enough to the end of it for everything we do or leave undone to have direct results for years to come. Moreover, the question of our relations with the Soviet Union stands right in the centre of the war, strategically and politically, and equally in the centre of all post-war problems. Our fight here against the anti-Soviet elements is fundamental. We must not merely refute every libel, scotch every rumour, block up every rat-hole, and continue the pressure for the strengthening of the Government by the removal of anti-Soviet elements; we must also fight for the positive aim of a united strategy and a full and sincere realisation and fulfilment of the Alliance. The campaign for the immediate opening of the Second Front is part of the whole struggle, and the opponents of the Second Front embrace the general anti-Soviet forces.

The battle is thus—after all—the battle we have been fighting for a long time already; it is not essentially different but is emphatically more urgent and intense than ever. There is perhaps one warning that is worth giving; we must not fall into the error—indeed the trap—of letting the advocacy of Anglo-Soviet friendship be misrepresented as in some way antithetical to Anglo-American friendship. It is true that in the U.S.A. also the struggle between anti-Soviet forces and pro-Soviet forces is being waged, more openly indeed than in this country; but that is merely an additional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason for developing our friendship with the American as well as with the Soviet peoples.

Once more, as so often already, the labour movement faces a task which is clear, well defined, and well understood, a task which is difficult only because we lack the strength that comes from complete unity. It is a task from which no section of the movement must flinch, for if we fail in it, we fail grievously, and our enemies score a great victory.

Three-Power Conference

by QUAESTOR

THE Three-Power Conference met in Moscow at a time when the tremendous continuing offensive of the Red Army, supported by Allied operations in the Mediterranean, had finally demonstrated to the whole world that an opportunity existed for drastically cutting down the duration of the war and of hastening victory over the enemy. Recognition of this inescapable fact was reflected in the political sphere in all the main groups of countries into which the world has been divided by the war.

Widespread anti-German feelings were openly expressed in Hungary, reported a group of Swedish journalists who had made an official tour (*The Times*, October 11). A prominent politician had told one correspondent "that the question for Hungary was whether the Germans, the Russians or the Anglo-Saxons would be first in the country." In Finland the Chairman of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee openly declared on the radio that Finland may have to part company with Germany; and Finnish social democratic leaders hastened to Stockholm to try and establish contact with the British Labour Party through the Swedish Social-Democrats. In Rumania the first fortnight of October was filled with reports of plot after plot against the Government and in favour of peace.

In the neutral camp, the trend was just as marked as among the Axis satellites. Sweden, after stopping transit traffic for Germany, stopped the export of iron ore. Portugal placed bases in the Azores at the disposal of Britain and U.S.A. The Spanish press continued increasingly to publish pro-Ally material supplied from its London correspondents, and once again Monarchist activities, favoured in London and hostile to the Axis, began to come out into the open. The Swiss Government plucked up courage in the middle of October to suppress a group of seven Fascist organisations inspired from Nazi sources.

In the Allied camp acknowledgements of the changed position began to be heard just as clearly. Perhaps the most naively outspoken was the message from the New York correspondent of the *Daily Express*, published on September 29, which summed up very clearly the general feeling expressed by politicians and publicists on both sides of the Atlantic during the month before the Moscow Conference opened. The message ran:—

> America foresees the possibility that events on the Russian front may overtake the Roosevelt-Churchill grand strategy plans, and force a speed-up of preparations for the opening of a new front in Europe.
>
> In Washington it is understood that Anglo-American planning was based on the likelihood that the German armies would make a stand this autumn on the Dnieper river. Now that the Russian armies are reported to be crossing that river at several points, and are approaching the Polish border in the North, Americans are talking about the possibilities of a collapse of the Nazi armies on the Eastern Front and all that might involve.
>
> There is therefore some revision in the accepted opinion that there will be no action in Western Europe until next year.

Not all British and American commentators drew the conclusion that an earlier opening of the Second Front in the West was necessary; but the general premiss

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a tide in the war had been irrevocably turned could be traced on all sides.

The enemy showed his own appreciation of this fact by redoubling propaganda about the possibility of a separate Soviet-German peace, in order, if possible, to keep the three great Allies apart at the very moment when there was a chance that, moved by various considerations, they might be on the point of concerting their military and political strategy for the first time. As usual, those fanatically anti-Soviet groups whose hatred of the U.S.S.R. has more than once made them vehicles of Hitlerite propaganda stepped forward again. In the United States, it was the groups scarified by *War and the Working Class*—the Hearst and Patterson Press, Colonel McCormick's *Chicago Tribune* and others. In Great Britain the papers which gave most prominence to the Nazi propaganda—of course carefully labelling it as such, but all the same devoting inches of their precious space to the anti-Soviet insinuations of the Goebbels machine—were Lord Camrose's *Telegraph* (for example, on October 9), and Lord Rothermere's *Sunday Dispatch* (October 3) and *Daily Mail* (October 8).

This was the military and political background when the Moscow Conference assembled: and, notwithstanding all the confusion and bewilderment caused by the political discussions, it was the military situation, the steady and careful but nevertheless inexorable drive forward of the Red Army on its gigantic front, which was uppermost in the minds of the European peoples. That was proved in October, beyond any doubt, by the far-reaching offensive operations of the Yugoslav army of liberation: by the fact that the only divisions of the surrendering Italian army which proved themselves eager and capable of battle were those which threw in their lot with the Yugoslavs and the Greeks: by the successes won by the Greek guerillas: and by the campaign for a loan to the French *franc-tireurs* and partisans, to buy arms and drugs for them, which was launched on their demand by the French Committee of National Liberation in Algiers.

As for the popular estimate of the significance of the Red Army's unexpected autumn victories among the British and American peoples, that received unwilling but quite eloquent tribute in the stream of propaganda, originating in Washington but loyally circulated in this country, reassuring the public about an early second front. On October 1, Reuter's Washington correspondent reported, on the authority of "reliable observers," that British and U.S. staff officers were shortly to confer with Soviet military officials in Moscow on plans for "the next operations" which had been in the making for several months. The *Daily Herald* (October 2) headed this: "Second Front Staff Talks in Moscow." The next day Reuter again learned in Washington "on excellent authority" that the Western Front in Europe "has been advanced by more than a month as a result of recent events on other European fronts, which have exceeded expectations." The *Sunday Times*, publishing this on October 3, headed the report: "Western Front to be Speeded Up." On October 6 the *News Chronicle* published another Washington message, again from Reuter's special correspondent, informing the world that "a high maritime authority who knows the Allied shipping situation thoroughly stated to-night that he was completely confident that a full-scale invasion of Europe from the West can, and almost certainly will, be carried out this year." This series could easily be considerably extended.

But, against this background of hard facts, of hopes and fears and propaganda, it is important to try to disengage the facts, so far as they can be ascertained, of the views with which the three Foreign Ministers were equipped by their Governments and ruling circles when they assembled in Moscow.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First, Britain. On the subject of the Second Front and bringing the war to an end as rapidly as possible, a member of the British War Cabinet had given a striking statement the previous month, at the British Trades Union Congress. Mr. Bevin then declared:—

> Our theory has been to keep down casualties and to provide our forces with the best equipment —overwhelming equipment—in the belief that metal is cheaper than men.

In the circumstances of this war, when total British casualties (even taking the Empire as a whole) have not exceeded 600,000 (killed, prisoners and wounded), while Soviet casualties in dead and probably dead are over five millions, Mr. Bevin's declaration will only mean one thing—the limitation of British casualties with the help of British metal, at the expense of Soviet casualties. To what extent had this "theory" been revised as a result of the amazing autumn offensive of the Red Army? There is one negative piece of evidence—the unanimity with which the entire British press of all parties (with the exceptions of the *Daily Worker* and *Reynolds News*) was declaring, up to October 13, that political questions would be the prime subject of discussion in Moscow. On that day, however, *Pravda* published an important survey of the foreign press ridiculing this suggestion, and saying plainly that the Three-Power Conference was confronted with quite real tasks of widening and strengthening co-operation, "not only in economic and political spheres, but above all in the military sphere." After a day's stunned silence, all talk of an impending Second Front, and equally of the exclusive discussion of political questions, disappeared from the British press. Instead, there appeared the following from the pen of the *Daily Express* political correspondent (October 15), clearly reflecting guidance from what are usually called well-informed diplomatic quarters":—

> The sole difference (between the three Governments) if one is shown to exist, is the precise time at which the Second Front shall be opened.
>
> The British view is clear: the Second Front, when it is opened, must not fail. It must be so prepared and on such a scale that it will be an overwhelming success. If it should fail, it will be impossible to try again, for, apart from Allied losses of men, arms and shipping, the attempt will bring into the open the vast secret organisations in the enemy-occupied lands which will help us.
>
> That, Mr. Eden may be expected to urge, makes it vitally important to all the United Nations, including Soviet Russia, that the chances of failure should be reduced to absolute minimum.

This statement certainly represents no real advance on Mr. Bevin's "theory." It presents the Second Front as an operation in itself, which has to fail or succeed in itself, and not as part of a combined Allied strategy—in which even inevitable losses in the West (and they could not possibly reach the same proportionate scale as the Soviet losses) would be amply justified for the United Nations as a whole, by their detachment of sufficient divisions from the Eastern Front (fifty or sixty, Stalin said) to change the whole balance of forces on the East and thus ensure immediate and overwhelming victory for the alliance.

If General Ismay, Mr. Churchill's principal military adviser as Minister of Defence, went with Mr. Eden only in order to advance the kind of argument against the immediate opening of a Second Front set forth by the writer quoted above, the British Government attitude on the most important question of the war gave little hope of far-reaching agreement with the Soviet Union.

On a number of other questions, mainly of a political nature, but all of them arising more and more acutely from the Red Army's advance, the British Government's attitude was less pronounced, and a realistic approach would make a solution in which the Soviet and British viewpoints coincided quite possible. Thus, it has now been made generally known that the British Government has given material support to the Yugoslav guerillas, and has reduced very considerably the unconditional enthusiasm for General Mihailovitch, owing to his suspicious dealings with the Fascist invaders

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and his very well known waging of war on the People's Liberation Army. Again, the British Government has declared itself anxious to ensure the independence of a strong Poland after the war, and with that in view wishes to see a resumption of relations between the Soviet Government and the Polish Government in London (*Sunday Times*, October 10th). But—in spite of the handsome lunches given by the Polish President and other officials in London to Mr. Eden and his military companions, on the eve of their departure for Moscow—the British Government probably remembers that the Polish seizure of Soviet territories in 1920 took place in defiance of a British Government proposal (the "Curzon Line"), and has not openly, at any rate, committed itself to supporting the demand put forward by the wilder British reactionaries for the restoration of the pre-1939 Polish Empire over millions of Ukrainians and Byelorussians.

On some other questions, the British attitude is less clear. Thus, no attempt appears to have been made to restrain or dissuade the British press from pre-conference speculations about the future of the Baltic States, whose peoples have long ago decided to enter the Soviet Union. Thus the *Daily Mail* (September 20) offered them the opportunity of entering a "Central Union" dominated by Poland: the *Daily Express* diplomatic correspondent (October 5th), informed the world that the post-war position of the Baltic States was on the agenda of the Moscow Conference: the *Sunday Dispatch* diplomatic correspondent (October 10) did the same. This is hardly to be wondered at, seeing that the former Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian ministers still appear in the Foreign Office Diplomatic List. Again, the utmost ambiguity still prevailed when Mr. Eden left for Moscow about the British Government's attitude to Czechoslovakia. The British Government has refrained, when repudiating the territorial settlement of Munich, from pledging itself explicitly to the restoration of Czechoslovakia's 1938 frontiers. The Czechoslovak President, Government and State Council naturally drew the conclusion from this and other events that it was necessary to secure the support, at any rate, of the Ally which stood by them in 1938, by renewing their treaty of mutual assistance with the U.S.S.R. in the form necessitated by the changed circumstances. The British Government then took upon itself, first to prevent President Benes from travelling to Moscow, and then to put up Mr. Eden in the House of Commons on September 22 to deprecate the whole proceedings. The diplomatic correspondent of *The Times* (October 4) explained that it was to prevent dangers from "an unregulated competition in alliances among the smaller powers." Why Portugal and Poland can have their individual alliances with Great Britain, but Czechoslovakia may not have one with the U.S.S.R., the British Government did not vouchsafe to explain.

So also with schemes for post-war Europe. There are many promising elements in repeated declarations that the British Government wants, not a division of Europe into "zones of influence," but a scheme of joint responsibilities of the Great Powers, buttressed by all the smaller ones, for maintaining peace (Mr. Bartlett in the *News-Chronicle*, October 8, and the *Sunday Times* diplomatic correspondent, October 10). But the explicit policy of Amgot in the occupied areas of Italy—not to allow freedom of association, particularly of Trade Unions and anti-Fascist political parties, the refusal of the B.B.C. to allow the French broadcasters to call for the formation of guerilla detachments and the extension of their activities: the public and unreserved declaration of confidence in the King of Greece by Mr. Churchill, at a time when the united fighting forces of the Greek people in their own country had refused George II any such confidence: these and similar events, still unexplained and uncorrected, give ground for doubt about British intentions in post-war Europe, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thereby sow confusion and difficulty. For the basis of genuine international collaboration in Europe after the war, the real guarantee against Great-Power domination of various European zones, is not some declaration of principles or "charter" but, as Paul Winterton put it in his illuminating cable from Moscow (*News-Chronicle*, October 7), a system of security in Europe "best achieved if the people of the European countries take control."

With what baggage did Mr. Cordell Hull travel from Washington to Moscow? Here the picture is less hard to trace, because American politicians are apparently less hampered than their British colleagues in pursuing a policy of unashamed pursuit of their own interests even to the detriment of international relationships. Brushing aside all the insulting insinuations about the alleged vagueness of Soviet policy, of which examples could be quoted from almost any survey of the American press during the month before the Conference, it is important to note that it was in the American press that was first launched the idea that the Moscow Conference would not discuss military questions—at the very time, as has been shown earlier, that a stream of propaganda was coming through Reuters from Washington, to the effect that the Second Front was virtually assured in the immediate future. No wonder that, as Mr. Waithman reported to the *News Chronicle* from Washington (October 11): "The Second Front issue has faded, probably because most Americans understand that the time and place of it have been irrevocably decided now." But when *Pravda* announced that the Soviet Union *was* going to raise the question at the Three-Power Conference, the New York *Herald-Tribune*—one of the most orthodox of papers—proclaimed that the announcement is "of a character to cause real concern," and that "if this were in fact the official Russian view, it would come very close to torpedoing the Conference in advance" (a statement which was also echoed in the London *Economist* on October 16). The fact is that in the United States many powerful influences have again and again shown themselves to favour the idea of the Second Front set forth by the New York correspondent of the *Daily Express* quoted earlier—that it is necessary only when there is a danger of the Red Army finally defeating the Germans.

The real danger about such views is not that they exist (their parallel could be found, by the way, in a recent discussion running for weeks in the London *Spectator*, as to whether Soviet losses were as much as fifty times British losses, or " only " twenty times), but that in the U.S.A. the forces which express them are more powerful than in Great Britain, so far as can be judged.

What was the approach of the Soviet Union to the problems of the Three-Power Conference?

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the importance attributed to the question of the Second Front. But it deserves to be underlined that the primary question for the Soviet Union, brought out again and again in recent statements, is that of shortening the war—not only because of the Soviet Union's own terrific losses in lives and material, but also because of the terrible losses daily inflicted on the European peoples by the continuation of Nazi occupation, and not least of all because of the disasters threatening the Western Allies themselves. An article in *War and the Working Class* carried a timely reminder to the latter of the aggravated economic and political difficulties which the absence of a Second Front is creating. *Izvestia* summed up the Soviet attitude on the eve of the Conference (October 16) as follows:—

> Already for nearly two and a half years the Red Army and our people have been waging a mortal struggle with the enemy, confronting almost the entire might of the Hitler war machine. The military and political situation is favourable for our Allies. To fail to take advantage of that, to extend the duration of the war, would mean to assume political responsibility for the immeasurable sufferings of tens of millions of people, for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prolonged grave dislocation of the entire political and economic life of the world.

Undoubtedly the problem of the resolute shortening of the war and the speediest achievement of victory is inseparably bound up with the problem of opening the Second Front in Western Europe. When agreement exists on problems of primary importance advanced by the progress of the war, it is easier to solve all the other necessary problems.

Contrary to what is frequently asserted, the Soviet attitude on those other problems has been made clear again and again, to those who don't want to remain as deaf and blind as British, French and American statesmen in the years before 1939. A glance at the Soviet attitude on the problems touched upon earlier will show this.

With regard to Yugoslavia and the guerilla movement generally, in France, Greece and elsewhere, it is well known that the Soviet Union has always uncompromisingly encouraged these movements, and opposed the would-be "statesmanlike" attitude of advisers on the B.B.C. who told the tortured peoples from France to Poland: "Have patience, wait." As recently as September 3, *War and the Working Class*, writing on the Yugoslav and Polish guerillas, demanded "complete and unreserved support of this movement by all true patriots." At the same time the Soviet Government maintained correct relations with the Greek, Yugoslav and other governments pursuing a contrary policy—even with the Polish Government until it openly launched its anti-Soviet campagin.

With regard to Poland itself, Stalin made absolutely explicit, in his statement to the American correspondent in Moscow, Mr. Cassidy, that the Soviet Government stands for a strong and independent Poland and wants its friendship. In order to fit deeds to words, it has made possible the raising, equipping and training of an entire Polish Army Corps, part of which is already at the front: and another corps is being formed. A Polish army which has fought its way back into Poland, shoulder to shoulder with the Red Army, and which has expressly disclaimed any desire to rule non-Polish peoples like the Ukrainians, the Byelorussians, the Czechs—what better guarantee of a strong and independent Poland could there be?

While *Pravda* has made once again quite clear that "the frontiers of the Soviet Union could no more be the subject of discussion than, say, the frontiers of the U.S.A.," the Soviet Union has been just as decided in regard to other countries that it has no wish to impose its social order or form of government upon them. In a press statement on August 12, it declared its readiness for a treaty of mutual assistance with Czechoslovakia: a declaration repeated on October 11 by *War and the Working Class* in its reply to Mr. Eden's statement in the House of Commons on President Benes. Even in regard to Finland, whose rulers proved so treacherous after the unexampled generosity of the Soviet-Finnish Peace Treaty of March 12, 1940, an article in *War and the Working Class* (October 11) calls upon the people of Finland to overthrow their Government, but requires no more than a "reliable guarantee," in the shape of self-government by the Finnish people, that they will for the future live "not in hostility, but in peaceful collaboration with the great Soviet people."

For this question of popular rule, as has been noted earlier, is the real basis of the Soviet conception of the future of Europe. It is on this basis that *War and the Working Class* (September 3) strongly criticised Amgot, for retaining the Fascist Government apparatus, and not attracting democratic elements of the Italian people. It was on this basis that *Pravda* (August 1) attributed political significance to the formation of the "Free Germany" National Committee in Moscow—that it "will contribute to the even more rapid growth of the ranks of the enemies of Hitlerite tyranny."

As for the basis of organisation in post-war Europe, the Soviet Government has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again and again underlined that "at present the principal task of the United Nations is to bring nearer the post-war period," and that "the fuller and the more effective the military, political and economic co-operation of the three Great Powers—the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the U.S.A.—the sooner will Hitlerite Germany be defeated, the stronger will be the foundations of the future peace, and the more successfully will be solved the problems of post-war organisation in the interests of all the Allied countries." At the same time the Soviet Government has in an official document—the Stalin-Sikorski declaration of December 4,1941—indicated in broad outline how it views post-war organisation for purposes of security. There should be "a new organisation of international relations": it should be based on "the unification of democratic countries in a durable alliance": and respect for international law "should be maintained by a collective armed force." The Anglo-Soviet Treaty of May 26, 1942, with its conception of Anglo-Soviet political, military and economic collaboration for twenty years after the war, in order to promote security and prosperity, as the nucleus of a union of "other likeminded States," was a practical step to the fulfilment of all three points. Stalin's statement of the "programme of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition," in his speech of November 6, 1942—with its emphasis on the equality of nations, the inviolability of their territories, the restoration of the sovereign rights of the liberated nations, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes—was a clear pointer to the principles on which the Soviet Government wants to see the new "organisation of international relations" constructed.

What emerges from this survey of the issues facing the Moscow Conference, and of the background on which it assembled? Above all, that the anti-Hitler coalition of freedom-loving peoples had an unexampled opportunity to choose between long-term policies of collaboration in reconstruction and peace, collaboration of the Socialist Soviet Union and of great capitalist States, collaboration of all peoples in the fullest sense of the word: and short-term policies of balance, and ambiguous compromise, and searching for position, in which peoples' interests tend to be overlooked or overridden, and the interests of small cliques and oligarchies advanced instead. The long-term policies, after a speedy victory, can bring the planned and co-ordinated harnessing of all human effort and enthusiasm to healing the frightful wounds which the war will have left, and to building up a world in which such a war will have been driven beyond the bounds of possibility. The short-term policies mean, at the very least, continued hideous suffering for millions, needless destruction of precious lives and values: and give no guarantee at the end that a new war will not be in the making.

But the long-term policies require a resolute decision to shorten the war today, by the fullest military collaboration with all the resources of all the Allies at the enemy's weakest spots—Western and Eastern Europe. By the time these lines appear, or very soon afterwards, we shall know whether the Western Allies have risen to this matchless opportunity.

The scarcity of LABOUR MONTHLY has been particularly felt among our readers in the Forces. One airman writes: "Any copies which civilian readers could send on to us will be greatly appreciated." Therefore, we would make two suggestions to those who feel they can spare their copy when they have finished with it: (1) send it on to a friend in the Forces; or (2) send it to us here, marked "Please Forward," and we will post it on to where it will be very warmly welcomed.

Soldiers, sailors and airmen please note. When writing, please say whether you would like these used copies sent you regularly; if so, do not forget to let us know when you change your address.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disquiet on the Home Front

by J. R. CAMPBELL

THE mining strikes in Lanarkshire and in Nottinghamshire and the engineering strikes in Barrow are portents of the serious situation that is developing on the Home Front. With the war not yet won national unity is in peril.

Back of the situation is the widespread feeling that the war is as good as won. Of course those who hold this view admit that we are still a long way from Berlin and that setbacks may still be encountered on the road. But most sections of the people are absolutely certain that nothing whatever can happen that will rob the allies of total victory. Even amongst some who were previously demanding the Second Front, there is a feeling that it is "on its way" and whether it is opened in the winter of 1943 or the summer of 1944 does not greatly matter. In this atmosphere the thoughts of many people are turning to the post-war world.

The employers are particularly anxious about the post-war economic position. Believing that one of the pre-requisites for increasing the competitive strength of British industry is a docile, poorly paid working-class, they are refusing to remedy legitimate grievances, and are even endeavouring to withdraw wartime concessions. Thus they provoke strikes.

There can be no question that the Barrow strike would never have taken place had the employers been prepared last May to give the consessions which they did after the strike had lasted a fortnight in the autumn.

This hardening attitude of the employers is connected with their desire to liquidate many of the wartime gains of the workers. If the mine-owners can provoke a number of strikes, they hope to be able to discredit the Government control of the industry and the pit production committees. If engineering managements can provoke strikes they may hope to discredit the idea of co-operation in the minds of the workers, so that the factory production committees are discredited in the workers' estimation.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised, therefore, that a certain reactionary section of employers are by no means averse to seeing a wave of strikes. The economic cost of the strikes will largely come out of their excess profits tax contributions, and the political gain may be vast. Already the South Wales Colliery Managers, reflecting their employers, are declaring that labour discipline has been terribly undermined by giving the workers the right to appeal against dismissals. The occurrence of a number of strikes will enable the reactionary employers to plead that what is wanted is the restoration of the unqualified right to sack and the restoration of full managerial prestige and authority, by forbidding the workers, through production committees or otherwise, to discuss managerial questions.

It is the trade unions and the British people therefore, and not the employers, who will be the main sufferers from a wave of unofficial strikes.

The employers are by no means confining themselves to a policy of pin-pricking. All over the country the 1940 Relaxation Agreement, prescribing the conditions on which women could replace men in the engineering industry, is being shamelessly flouted by the employers. A Court of Enquiry had to be held recently in consequence of the attitude of the well-known Rolls Royce firm to this agreement and from its findings great new problems have emerged.

The Government itself appears to be quite willing to add to the inflammable material which may at any moment burst forth in industry. Not a single one of the major reforms promised by the Government has yet been embodied in a parliamentary bill. Instead the Government appears to be engaged in a vast delaying

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action. The case of the Beveridge report is well known, but possible the most blatant example is afforded by the treatment of the Uthwatt report, on the passage of which into law any effective housing and town-planning schemes depend.

The Uthwatt Committee was appointed in January, 1941, at a time when it was evident that the aftermath of the blitz would present the local authorities with vast new town-planning problems. The final report of the Committee was presented to the Government in September, 1942. A whole year passes and instead of legislation being introduced, it is gravely announced that the Government had come to certain conclusions and will shortly embody them in a White Paper.

No wonder the idea is spreading that the Government is seeking to disengage itself from its obligations.

And more and more blatantly the employers, and certain Government personalities like Captain Balfour, are coming out for the ending of any state controls which limit the employer's autocracy and his drive for profits. Of course, all controls are not equally anathema to these reactionaries. They will welcome the "inefficient bureaucratic state" when it comes with subsidies in its hand; they will cheer when it raises tariffs and cuts down import quotas; they will call on it to coerce independent firms into monopolist trade associations. Far be it from the monopolists to object to the State controlling other people in their interests. What they most violently detest is the State controlling them (however mildly) in the interests of the people.

Were this clamour against all forms of state control which interfere with the activities of the monopolists to succeed it would destroy the major post-war aspirations of the British people—steady work and good wages for all.

For there is no "invisible hand" directing the activities of squabbling groups of monopolists in such a way that the combined result will be steady employment for the people.

The effort to maintain a high level of employment will demand a greater measure of state control of industry and finance, a control directed to different purposes by (in many cases) different people. That is why the abolition, instead of the transformation, of many of the existing controls will be a mockery of the hopes of our people.

It may be difficult for the pompous business man and his political stooges to realise the harm that is being done by this loose talk. The middle-aged workers remember, however, what happened when the unrestricted right of the employers to sack was restored after the last war, during the transition from the war to the peace economy. At a moment's notice the leading shop stewards were dismissed, workshop organisation was ruthlessly broken up, piece-rates were cut, and a ferocious purge of all the workshop militants was indulged in. Neither can those workers forget the hectic rise in prices, with wages jumping painfully behind, leading to the spectacular collapse of industry in 1920, followed by the mining-lock-out of 1921 and the engineers' lock-out of 1922. No wonder the feeling is growing that if the employers—as seems all too evident from their speeches and actions—are out to repeat the dose after this war, the workers had better be showing their teeth now.

If national unity is to be reinvigorated for the heavy trials that still lie ahead, the problems of the home front have to be tackled by combined political and economic measures.

Outstanding is the need for bringing home to everyone an understanding of the dangers of relaxing their efforts for victory. There the labour movement, which in many districts is completely inactive, has a major responsibility. The workers are naturally suspicious of Government inspired spokesmen. They need their own local leaders to speak to them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The opening of the Second Front in the West would have a mighty effect on morale. The longer this is held up, the longer the war is prolonged, the greater is the damage that is done to civilian morale.

In the Government's own hands there rests the only effective answer to the charge that it is double-crossing the people with respect to the promised reforms. Let legislation implementing the Beveridge plan, the education reforms, the national health service, be introduced and energetically pushed through the House of Commons. The long holidays enjoyed by the members of this institution, its infrequent sittings even when not nominally on holiday, is a bad example to everyone in the country. A speeding-up of administrative and legislative output is surely called for.

The Labour Party should take the lead in the fight for the early opening of the Second Front and for the translation into legislation of the long-promised reforms. We are not asking the Labour Party to step out of the framework of national unity. We are asking it to recognise that the Second Front, described by the British Government as "urgent" in the spring of 1942, is overdue in the winter of 1943. We are not asking it to demand the passing of Socialist measures but to insist that the reforms promised by the Government in 1940 ought to be on their way to the Statute Book in 1943.

Provocative employers should be emphatically warned that the Government will not tolerate them manoeuvring to get a post-war stranglehold on the workers. There seems little doubt that certain supply departments of the Government are giving such employers the excuse that they are looking for by insisting that they cut their costs. It is essential, of course, that employers' costs should be cut to the minimum, but this should not involve any attack on existing wages or prevailing piecework prices. For the Government to connive at or tolerate wage-cutting is for it to become an accessory in the provocation of strikes.

The Unions, the Government and the employers are under an obligation to look to the efficiency of the existing negotiating or arbitration machinery, for the complaints about its slowness are swelling in volume. This will probably involve the appointment of more arbitrators and perhaps more negotiators from the Unions and the employers. And is it absolutely necessary to couch the arbitration awards in such cloudy official language? We are not amongst those who want to see official documents written in snappy journalistic style, for care has to be exercised in weighing every word in an award which will subsequently become a matter for negotiation. But carefulness and prolixity (when necessary) surely do not involve the downright obscurity of the famous award 326, around which the Barrow strike raged. If it is impossible to present the actual award in a completely popular form—a statement of the court's intentions in the form of a preamble seems to be called for.

Finally, the Unions would be well advised to canalise some of the anxieties of their members concerning the post-war world into constructive channels. The Unions in the war industries which are bound to shrink should be taking all possible steps to safeguard their members.

They should be discussing amalgamation in a businesslike fashion and be settling once and for all the role of shop stewards committees in a recognised trade union movement. Recognising the dangers to which their best militants will be exposed in the transition period, they ought to be seeking such agreements with the employers and such legislation from the Government as will protect the trade union shop stewards committees in the post-war world. No employer should be permitted to carry on business without recognising the Trade Union and its workshop organisation, any more than he is allowed to consistently violate the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Factory Acts. The Trades Union Congress at Southport passed resolutions to this effect. Now is the time to implement them.

Lastly the Unions in the war industry must insist on the Government controls on industry remaining during the transition of peace economy. These controls will have new tasks. They will have to ensure that the rights of the workers who were in the industry before the war are fully safeguarded when the redundant labour is being transferred elsewhere. They will help to ensure that peace-time orders for engineering, shipbuilding and other work are prepared now, ready for being placed in those industries when war production ceases.

By keeping the war always in the front of the workers and by directing their unrest into the abovementioned constructive channels, the labour movement can ensure that a steady advance in working-class unity and power takes place. Not by sporadic outbursts, but by concentrated united advance, can we safeguard working-class interests in war and in peace.

Industry and Employment after the War

by MAURICE DOBB

THE discussions which in the past six months have been coming to the fore about "post - war reconstruction" have, in regard to economic questions, mainly centred round the relations between the State and capitalist industry in the post-war period. In 1918 there was a precipitous rush to abandon the war-time controls and to restore the pre-1914 *status quo*. This was the policy advocated by Big Business, advocated by City organs like *The Economist* (which wrote "the first requisite of industry is the restoration of freedom" and "as soon as the merchant gets his hands free, we shall see trade begin to revive"—November 16, 1918, and February 1, 1919) and, after a brief period of discussion of alternative proposals for "tapering off" the controls more slowly and utilising government factories for peace-time purpose, was adopted as the policy of the Government (largely, it appears, at the insistence of the direct representatives of industry in the government, such as the Chamberlain family and Sir Eric Geddes).

Apart from the still-small group of so-called Individualists, few, if any, of the public utterances on the subject have advocated a repetition of this policy this time. On the contrary, most of them have warned against any precipitate removal of State controls, at least during the transition period between war and peace. It does not, of course, follow that the leaders of industry will not attack the controls and exert pressure in this direction as they did last time: in fact, there are already signs of such a tendency (e.g., criticisms of Sir Stafford Cripps' action regarding Shorts, etc.); and it may be that capitalist interests, whose actions will be more decisive in the end than the theories of pamphleteers and report-makers, are simply biding their time. But here a consideration of outstanding importance has to be borne in mind. The twenty years between two wars has witnessed a very great development of monopoly in British industry; and moreover, the latter half of that period particularly has witnessed a considerable growth of *State-aided* monopoly—of monopolistic organisation established with State sanction and aid, able to use the weapon of the law to enforce its regulations concerning price or output or the limitation of productive capacity and to bring smaller firms or recalcitrant "independents" into line. In the coal industry, for example, we have seen an instance of compulsory cartellisation framed in an Act of Parliament. It seems fairly evident

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that many of the leading firms in industries which have had war-time concentration-of-production schemes hope that such schemes can be adapted after the war to serve a similar function. It may well be, therefore, that the monopolistic industries, or the larger firms which hope for a monopolistic or semi-monopolistic position, will pursue the policy, not of scrapping the controls, but of adapting these controls to their own purposes; it being left to the smaller firms, anxious for their place in the field, to champion "independence" and be advocates of a return to individualistic *laissez-faire*. If this be the case, the post-war issue will not be the simple one of pro- and anti-State controls; but a more complex one, where the dividing-lines are more difficult for the politically untrained eye to see: the issue of State controls which simply buttress-up and reinforce monopoly (such as we knew in the decade before the war, and which we have seen even since the war began) versus a policy of State controls aimed *against* monopolistic practices and policies of restriction in favour of the maximum of planned expansion of production for the benefit of the people.

It is by this criterion that we should presumably approach the two recently-published documents before us* since both of them advocate an extension, not a contraction, of the economic functions of the State after the war. Mr. Herbert Morrison, in the first of the speeches reprinted in this pamphlet, lays down the principle that:—

> To ensure full national output and a proper welfare standard for all, much of the social control of production which we have learnt to accept and to value during the war will need to be continued during the peace. . . . I myself can see no sharp distinction in nature between the economic problems of war and the problems of the strenuous, difficult peace that lies before us.

Mr. Morrison, therefore, makes it clear that he does not stand with the back-to-*laissez-faire* Individualists. Moreover, he goes further: he defines what the *objective* of such "social control of production" should be:—

> That means turning our backs for ever on schemes of restriction, whether of goods or of labour. . . . Never again dare we, on any grounds, whether economic or moral, be indifferent if our productive machine is standing idle or running down or if the energies of the people are unused or under-used. It will be suicidal, after the war, for financial authorities and Governments to stand by, while great industries are more than half idle and great areas of the country are in distress.

These are brave words which we can all applaud, as we may also many of the remarks in a lecture on The Future of Exports, which declares that "there lies before all nations the possibility of a tremendous expansion in world trade," and that we should think about foreign trade, not in terms of "making competitors," but "as making markets in the spirit of glorious and constructive adventure" in providing the world with the goods it is clamouring for. It is true that there is nothing here about the obstacle to expanding markets in a capitalist world: perhaps this can hardly be expected in brief popular speeches from a Minister of the Crown. But what we chiefly miss in these pages is any specific recognition that State aid to industry can be, and has been, used to buttress monopoly, not to down it; any recognition (save in quite general terms about policy in the passage we have quoted) of the fundamental distinction in practice between the two forms of State intervention; still less any mention of concrete measures by which the power of monopolies can be curbed and their restrictive policies broken. In an address to the Yorkshire Regional Council of the Labour Party, entitled The State and Industry, he seems to be searching for some new "middle way" between Socialism and the old *laissez-faire capitalism*. He says:—

> Neither the slogan of all-round nationalisation nor the slogan of all-round decontrol are, as such, the slightest use to the country

---

* *Prospects and Policies* by the Rt. Hon. Herbert Morrison, M.P. (Cambridge University Press, 6*d* net).

Employment Policy & Organisation of Industry after the War: A Statement, Nuffield College (Oxford University Press, 2*s*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and he presents, as the alternative to "sectional corporatism, or Fascism in its economic forms, however disguised and however politely presented":—

a practical mixture of genuine Socialism and genuinely free enterprise, the whole resting upon and in turn supporting national policies of social and industrial welfare.

As to what this is to mean in practice, we are told only that, in the case of "industries which cannot be carried on properly at all except on a monopoly basis," "instead of leaving them in private hands . . . we should get better national service from them if we turned them into public corporations like the Central Electricity Board, the London Transport Board or the B.B.C.," while, in the case of industries which "come nearer and nearer to being monopolies in fact," "the answer may be anything from a public corporation to some form of management under a board of directors with a nationally nominated chairman."

The Nuffield College Report is "the outcome of a series of Private Conferences held in Oxford under the auspices of Nuffield College," composed by a drafting committee in an attempt to extract the highest common factor of agreement from those participating, and published "as a contribution to the discussion of post-war problems." Among its sponsors are Fabians such as Mr. G. D. H. Cole, a number of economists of the younger generation, the Master of Balliol and Sir Cyril Norwood, Mr. G. le M. Mander to represent progressive Liberal opinion, and trade unionists such as Mr. G. Chester and Mr. R. Coppock. In many respects this document runs along parallel lines to the speeches of Mr. Morrison, but it is fuller and more specific. In two respects it seems to go beyond what Mr. Morrison explicitly proposes: in recognising two important spheres for "planning" by the State. In the first place it lays great emphasis on a policy of planned State investment through a National Development Board, "to which should be entrusted the control of funds available for public investment . . . and the supervision of all State investment in productive enterprise, together with the function of licensing such capital issues or other forms of capital expenditure as may be made subject to public control." This it regards as an essential instrument for a policy of full employment—to maintain investment at a level sufficient to combat tendencies towards slumps and mass unemployment. Accessory to this, it contemplates "government direction of the banking system as a whole . . . with a view to ensuring that the policy of ' full employment' shall not be hindered by any shortage or mis-direction in the supply of credit," and also "an effective control over the prices of builders' materials" and of contract-prices for constructional work and the possible use of the war-time device of "agency factories," using war-time factories erected at State expense to organise the production of building materials and pre-fabricated units for State-owned or controlled enterprises. Secondly, it attaches "cardinal importance" to measures for State control of the location of industry "as a necessary element in town and country planning." It is proposed that there should be a Ministry of Planning to deal with town and country planning and also a Minister for Economic Development; while there should be a separate "capital budget" presented to Parliament, which unlike the ordinary budget "would not need to be covered by taxation."

By implication the Report appreciates the crucial limit which stands in the way of a policy of State control over investment, while industrial production is in the hands of capitalist firms: namely, the limited effect it can have, as anything but a short-term expedient, unless it is prepared to encroach on the sphere of ordinary capitalist industry and to come in conflict with the monopolistic interests of capitalist industry, anxious to *restrict* investment in new productive capacity, not to extend it. It states:—

the demand for capital goods is very highly concentrated upon certain types of industry—especi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ally transport and public utilities—and it is evident that an application of the Public Corporation principle to cover a number of the industries and services which are among the largest consumers of capital goods, both for extension and for replacements, would give much more scope for the pursuance by the State of an investment policy calculated to promote " full employment."

That the interests which control industry (and not financial control) is the crux of the matter seems, therefore, to be recognised. Here the Report lays down the principle quite clearly that State control over industry must combat monopolistic interests and policies. Whether the measures it outlines are likely to be effective in doing so, however, may be questioned; and this clearly deserves fuller discussion. But the *intention,* at least, is enunciated. The Report recognises that "monopolistic practices are not confined to industries subject to the necessities of large-scale production, but are often found elsewhere," and wishes "severe checks" to be placed on the profit-motive "wherever it threatens to result in the holding up of prices and the restriction of production and employment, in pursuit of high profit-margins." "The power to fix prices, either directly or by the regulation of output or capacity, is not one that can properly be left to the discretion of any concern or association without a decisive overriding control in the public interest": accordingly, a State Industrial Tribunal should "disallow instruments of association" in the case of any Trade Associations "which contemplate the use of such powers." But the Report seems much too complacent in thinking that restrictive policies by such bodies are largely product of depression-periods and contracted markets, and that with an expansionist policy aiming at full employment the temptation to adopt such anti-social policies would largely disappear.

As regards the forms and methods of State control over industry the Report is rather more vague: possibly because this was a question about which it was more difficult to get common agreement. It starts from the axiom that "there is growing agreement that, where any industry is to be publicly administered, the administration should take the form of a Public Corporation, with a Board appointed by the State." It does not say how, if these Boards "consist mainly of persons with direct managerial, technical or other practical working experience of the industries or services concerned" (as is proposed), they can be safeguarded from becoming, like many war-time controls, instruments of vested interests in the trade, except to say that appointments "should be made on grounds of personal suitability, no member should serve on it as the representative of any particular interest."

Industry as a whole is divided into three categories. *First* come "industries and services which because of their key importance in the maintenance of general investment activity or by virtue of their basic character and the dependence on them of a wide range of other industries and of basic services vital to the consuming public, or for both reasons" should not be left in private hands but should be "carried on under public ownership by Public Corporations." The boundaries between the three groups is left undefined—"an open question for the future"; and provision is made for a transitional form in some cases in the shape of "some form of partnership between the State and private enterprise." It is indicated, however, that public utilities and transport should fall within this first group, and probably also the extractive industries, in particular coal.

The *second* category consists of "other major industries which, by virtue of their size and the nature of their products, occupy key positions and are liable, in default of public regulation, to fall under the predominant influence of a small number of concerns" (i.e., be monopolistic or semi-monopolistic). For this category the Report does not suggest public ownership, but instead control by Public Industrial Boards, "which would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be responsible, in consultation with the economic organs of Government, for the formulation of general economic policy for the industries concerned." These Boards should consist "mainly of representatives of the industry, including labour representatives," together with "at least two appointed members having no financial connection with the industry" and "a full-time impartial chairman." Their task would primarily consist of reducing costs and prices by schemes of standardisation, concentration of production in the most suitable technical units, pooling of patent-rights, etc. They should ensure that "new firms must be able to enter freely and existing firms must be left to expand or contract according to the quality of service they are able to provide," but "there must be no powers vested in the Boards themselves either to limit output or to fix minimum prices."

Thirdly, come small or medium-sized industries, which are to be left free from any specific machinery of control, except that no trade association in such a trade should "be allowed to exercise any compulsory powers over the trade unless it accepts a Board" of the type suggested for the second category, and no trade association should be allowed to fix prices or output.

Regarding Labour, the Report proposes that "the Social Security proposals of the Beveridge Report should be carried into legislative effect at the earliest possible moment"; that "the principle of minimum wage-rates related to the cost of living and of a standard working week for all industries and employments should be accepted and made effective by legislation"; that "there should be a widespread acceptance of the guaranteed week" and "holidays with pay should be made universal" and coupled with "the development of adequate holiday facilities"; trade union recognition should be conceded in all industries, Works Councils and Joint Production Committees should be continued after the war and extended, while the Factory Acts should be strengthened in the interest of improved health, and "welfare arrangements in factories should be widely extended on the lines developed during the war, including the provision of factory canteens and of factory medical services in large establishments."

This Report is evidence of a growing awareness among progressive-minded people of some of the problems involved in combating unemployment and monopoly, and assists in providing for us a basis of discussion. That the machinery and the powers it proposes will be adequate to control the immense powers of monopoly-interests in practice—for the controls to dominate instead of being dominated—is to be doubted. The central problem is, not simply one of devising appropriate economic machinery, but, above all, a *political* problem: a problem of who controls the machinery of State, and for what interests—a problem of power. In the struggles that lie ahead in the transition from war to peace results will depend less on the detail of paper schemes than on the vigour with which a united labour movement is able to make its voice heard and its will felt, and organised bodies of consumers, such as the co-operatives and other organs of an active democracy, are able to exert their influence in the direction and control of industry.

Publications Received

BOOKS

Through Soviet Russia by Major A. S. Hooper (Reprint) (published by the Author, 98 pp., 1*s*).

One World by Wendell L. Willkie (Cassell & Co., 170 pp., 7*s*6*d*).

Voice of Civilisation by Denys Thompson (An enquiry into Advertising) (Fredk. Muller Ltd., 220 pp., 7*s*6*d*).

Soviet Asia by R. A. Davies and A. J. Steiger (V. Gollancz, 7*s*6*d*, 206 pp.).

The Trial of Mussolini by " Cassius " (V. Gollancz, 2*s*6*d*, 82 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Families of the Kayyur Heroes

by N. M. JOSHI

(General Secretary of All-India Trades Union Congress)

[*The following note on the families and accompanying letter received from N. M. Joshi is very revealing, not only of their needs, but of general Indian conditions.*—ED. L.M.]

THANK YOU for the money sent to us for the Kayyur Dependants. We received £250 on July 13 and a further draft for £250 reached us on September 15. This makes a total of £500, or Rupees 6,655 2s. Regarding the distribution, we consulted Comrade E. M. S. Namboodripad, a well-known Communist peasant leader of Malabar, and on his advice we have decided to divide the available amount evenly among the four families. This we feel is the best course, as the slightly less poor family has more members, while the very poor family (Abu Baker's) has only two members. We are making arrangements for the distribution, which will take us a month, as Kayyur is a remote village. I am sending a note on the four families.

Abu Baker's Family.
A mother of 65 years old and a brother of 15 years. They have no means of livelihood. They were entirely dependent on him. They are also harassed by their relations, who, as rigid and orthodox Muslims, did not approve of their association with Communists and with struggles waged by the Kisan Sabha (peasant organisation). Their only property is a small thatched house.

Chirukandan's Family.
Mother about 45 years, sister about 15 years. No means of livelihood. No house; the house that they had was destroyed by the Malabar Special Police during their stay in the area just after the Kayyur incident. They are now living in a thatched shed (with no walls) put up on the foundations of the former house.

Madathil Appu's Family.
Father about 60 years, is a priest among Thiyyas, backward community of Malabar. Mother about 55 years. Elder brother, an active worker in the Kisan organisation, about 30 years, and his wife, a women's organisation worker, about 22 years. Sister about 18 years. The money will be divided between the father, mother and sister. They have leased property of 5 acres—and get an income of about Rs.30/- a year (£2 6s.).

Kunhambu Nair's Family.
Father about 67 years; mother 50 years. Elder brother, an active worker in the Kisan organisation, about 37 years. Younger brother also a Kisan worker, 22 years. Youngest brother—15 years old. Younger sister about 24 years. Two wives of elder brother, both about 27 years old. Own wife, about 21 years, a women's organisation worker. The money will be divided between the father, mother, wife, younger brother and sister who are dependent on him. They have leased property of 4 acres, but because they pay less rent, their income is slightly more than that of Madathil Appu's family—*i.e.*, about Rs.50/- a year (just under £4).

[*The Fund for the relief of the families now stands at* £650. *The target is* £1,000. *Donations from persons or organisations should be sent to R. Bridgeman, Treasurer, Kayyur Dependants' Fund,* 9, *Southampton Place, London, W.C.*1. *An army private, sending* 30s. *from himself and his fellows, writes : "We were very deeply stirred by the moving article by P. C. Joshi in the August* LABOUR MONTHLY, *and fervently hope that events will very soon prove that the Indian martyrs did not die in vain."*—ED. L.M.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

The Future of Germany

The Problem of Germany. (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 92 pp., 2s6d.)
Germany Today—and Germany Tomorrow by Paul Merker, M.d.L. (I.N.G., 57 pp., 1s6d.)

THE FIRST of these booklets has special importance, not because of its merit, but because it is the nearest we are likely to get to an account of the way minds are working on the problem of Germany at the Foreign Office. It is a study by "a number of qualified people, representing a balanced variety of experience and outlook," who were invited by the Royal Institute of International Affairs to discuss the problems which are likely to arise between a victorious Britain and a defeated Germany.

The authors pose two possible attitudes to Germany: first, the policy of pure force—"the conscious, continuous, and total purpose to keep the enemy in subjection"—and, secondly, total co-operation with Germany on the basis of equality. They proceed to consider, in a detached and "realist" way, the merits of the application of these policies in relation to the power politics of post-war Europe; Germany's frontiers; German liberties; arms, and so on.

The Europe which they foresee is very similar to Europe between the two wars, but now Britain is to occupy the position which France held then, with America taking over the role of Britain. Britain is to take "the first shock of a German westwards drive." She must therefore learn from France's mistakes last time. France, we are told, became so preoccupied with her own security that she estranged "the powerful forces of Anglo-Saxon humanitarianism." So after this war Britain must be prepared for flexibility and compromise lest she lose American support.

On these premises, which leave the Soviet Union almost entirely out of the picture, the authors argue that it will not pay Britain to attempt either total subjection of Germany or total co-operation with her. They reject the policy of dismemberment of Germany and indicate the lines along which it will be necessary to compromise with her "tough power structure." The only direction in which they plump for the unrestricted use of force is in the prevention of German rearmament.

To Socialists the most remarkable feature of this booklet is the clarity with which it expresses the philosophy and dilemmas of a class. Gone are the glorious days of British imperial expansion when history could be regarded as leading inevitably to the permanent supremacy of the British Empire. History is no longer a process; it is a series of emergencies which can only be met by improvisations. Even the fact of human progress is doubtful.

Nowhere is this bankrupt "philosophy" better illustrated than in the authors' final conclusion regarding the probable outcome of the present war:—

> "We shall move not to some grand climax, some static and all-in 'solution', but from one state of the provisional to another. We can but make our best endeavours from stage to stage, inspired by the vision of rendering the world, moulded as it is by many causes and many wills, better, were it by the merest fraction, rather than worse."

What a trumpet call! What a message to the youth which is fighting and dying to achieve the liberation of mankind!

It need scarcely be added that there is no difference in temper and outlook between the authors of this booklet and Lord Vansittart. Their view of the causes of the present war is equally warped. Thus their account of attempts to preserve the peace between 1922 and 1939 ignores Soviet efforts to build a collective front to resist aggression. March, 1936, is given as the last date on which there was an opportunity of employing a superior armament to keep Germany in check. Their only difference from Vansittart lies in their estimate of the degree of force which should be applied to Germany in order to safeguard Britain's security.

It would be a black prospect if there was no alternative policy in the field. Fortunately, the policy of the Soviet Union, with which the authors do not appear to be familiar, shines like a beacon for humanity. This is no improvisation which stands pat upon its own security. It puts foremost the need to smash Nazi Germany by a military victory. But alongside of this it looks to what is new and developing in the German situation—the resistance movement of the German people themselves to the Hitlerite tyranny. It recognises that the answer to the problem of Germany must be given by the German people through their *actions*. Whereas the authors of our booklet stand aside from the resistance movement as "an uncertainty" upon which "emphatically we cannot build", the Soviet Union consciously and deliberately seeks to strengthen the anti-Fascist forces.

The fact that such forces exist and are growing is clearly demonstrated by the second booklet under review. It is a sincere and well-informed account of the situation in Germany, written by a German who has himself worked for many years in the underground movement. It does not give an exaggerated picture of a widespread and fully-organised opposition, but it indicates how the opposition works and where its roots are to be found. There is an excellent foreword by D. N. Pritt and I warmly recommend the booklet.

The author gives in an appendix, the very important "Manifesto" of the recently-formed "Free Germany Committee." It cannot be brought too often to the attention of the British Labour Movement. Read in conjunction with Stalin's speeches made on the 6th November, 1941, 1942, and 1943, it gives complete expression to the policy which is gaining increasing support amongst democrats in this country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Manifesto calls on all sections of the German people to wage a war of liberation to overthrow Hitler. If this can be achieved by the Germans themselves and not solely by the armies of the coalition then they are promised that *there will be no dismemberment of Germany*. Germany will return to the ranks of people enjoying equal rights and will win *the right to decide the question of its state*. While it is clear that the German war criminals and their accomplices must receive a just and merciless trial, there is promised *an amnesty for all those adherents of Hitler who recant in time and join the movement for a free Germanv*.

These proposals are bold and uncompromising. They have already won a response from the British Trade Union Movement in the rejection of the "Vansittart" resolution of the General and Municipal Workers at the Southport Congress. Unfortunately the Railway Clerks amendment did not enable the question to be put with complete clarity, but there is no doubt that the mass of the workers support the policy which has been advanced by the Soviet Union and now by the "Free Germany Committee" in Moscow. It must be recognised that the policy may not succeed; the German people may not rise to their destiny. But when it is coupled with hammer blows against the German war machine it is the only policy which offers hope to Germany and to the world.

G. R. SANDISON.

China Advancing

The Birth of New China by Arthur Clegg. (Lawrence and Wishart, 144 pp., 3s6d).

THERE IS no more futile occupation than trying to identify the moment when "the world was saved" from Fascist conquest. It was saved a dozen times, beginning with the thousands of martyrs who fought the Nazi and Fascist tyrants in their own countries and in death left a legacy to other brave men who loved freedom and in turn died for it. It was saved during the civil war in Spain and in China; by sacrifices in the early stages of the European War; and in the Battle for Britain; and on the Dniester and the Dnieper and Stalingrad. And it is being saved every day in the battles now fought in Europe and the Pacific.

But surely there was a rather long hour when, not merely alone but alone for over two years against a Japan backed by the economic resources of the great Powers, China held together to fight for liberty in a war which seemed hopeless. It is self-evident now that had she divided then, or capitulated at any time during her six years fight, to join the Japanese in Asiatic war against the Western Powers—which would not have lacked its ironic justification—our own lives would have been vastly altered. Never mind why. The thing to remember, when she claims her right to sit in the hall of the great nations, is that China did not.

Mr. Arthur Clegg reminds us of that fact on many a page of his admirable little book, which covers with excellent understanding the recent history of China and describes sympathetically the ordeal of our Eastern Ally. What China has contributed to the world grows out of her own self-realisation and awakening to the deepest social impulses of our time. Mr. Clegg thinks that the gains of the war for China can, on the whole, best be seen in terms of her "unification"—politically, economically, culturally and militarily.

First, he says, China has been physically unified by better communications, the opening up of the backward areas, and the building of roads, railways and airways. Culturally there has been a gain in mass education and in closer ties between north and south. Modern industry has been brought to many areas for the first time and the beginnings of co-operative industry have been made. Politically the people have benefited much; progressive schemes have been adopted by the Government which, if they are translated from paper promises to reality, should put China well in the vanguard of democratic peoples.

But Mr. Clegg also realises that "the end is not yet." There is still to be achieved a working unity between the Communist and Kuomintang regions, a solution to the land question through widespread agrarian reform, and the fulfilment of democracy, along lines already promised, through the establishment of representative popularly elected government, which would permit the existence of various parties and admit their contribution to the national life.

I like very well the way he sums it all up:—

> "The mass of the Chinese people—peasants and workers, students, professional and other classes—think in simple and wholesome terms of the victory, of offensive action so that it can come speedily, of a system after the war which brings peace, raises the standard of living of the people and increases their power in government. And, as the war has shown, the weight of the people is the main force in Chinese politics to-day, distinguishing the period from all earlier periods."

Mark especially the last sentence. It is perfectly true. And it may be a comforting thing to remember when, in months to come, Chinese history may for a time seem to take a backward turn. The war itself has been carried on, not because of the will of an individual general or two, or the fine speeches made for western ears by any of the talented ruling families, but because fundamentally the rulers had no choice. Had they tried to take another path the country would have speedily disowned them.

And in the future those who seek to renew civil war, to keep the people fastened down in the traces of feudalism which this struggle was fought to overthrow, who attempt to monopolise the political and economic power of the nation in the interest of corrupt cliques and families in power, will find themselves facing the same dilemma. Clegg says that through this struggle the Chinese people "have set their foot upon the road of progress and will never be turned back." Not for long, at any rate.

E. S.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in October, 1943 : £89 : 7 : 6

MORE DONATIONS to the Fund this month, but still not quite enough to reach the necessary £100. How can we reach our target in November? By making full use of the Collecting Sheets amongst our fellow-workers and friends; by passing our copy on and getting a "reading fee"; and last, but not least, by delving into our own pockets. It only needs that little extra effort to attain our goal.

LET'S SEE THAT WE GET £100 IN NOVEMBER

	£	s.	d.
Stanghon		1	0
Macfarlane		1	0
F. Overington		2	6
Dewsbury Socialist Society		13	0
[illegible] Hacker		3	0
[illegible] Coombes		1	0
[illegible] Belsey		2	6
S. Clegg		8	2
M. Thornhill		10	0
R. Carpenter		5	0
J. A. Smith		2	6
J. Clifford		13	0
Wm. Allen		3	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
G. Robson		5	0
R. Barrett		7	6
F. M. Soudain		3	0
E. Stout and Friends		7	0
Learner		2	0
S. J. Berry		14	0
D. Parvin		3	0
B. Sokoloff		2	0
J. Rattray		2	6
L'Humanite		2	0
R. Oliver		1	0
J. Massey		1	6
C. Penn	1	0	6
R. J. Mecredy		10	0
A. MacLean		7	0
Godin		10	0
J. Smith		3	6
E. Beck and Friends		3	0
S. Morrissy		12	0
J. W. Atkinson		5	0
R.O.F., South Wales		6	6
P. Russell		5	0
J. J. Trott		3	0
H. J. Knight		3	0
M. Kirkowitz		2	0
American 9th Army Air Force	2	10	0
A. C. Grabham		3	0
D. H. Strathern	1	2	0
D. Gardner		2	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
J. Macdonald		2	6
American Friend		2	6
J. W. Turner		4	0
B. Muskett	1	0	0
M. M.		1	6
C. Comiskey	1	0	0
T. Dearden		3	0
P. Pearman		2	6
J. McCaughey		3	0
F. Richards		3	0
Four Red Soldiers in R.A.		7	6
P. E. Brown		2	6
O. Rutherford	1	0	0
D.29		2	6
L. de Syllas		5	0
G. J. Morey		10	0
Three Troopers		10	0
D. F. Oakeshott		2	6
R. Stevenson		5	0
T. H. Smith		7	0
A. B. Edwards		10	0
D. Robinson		2	6
P. Andrews	1	0	0
E. Wintringham		14	0
D. Percival		13	0
N. & S. Deakin		5	0
Losers at Chess		10	2
Lower Morden D.G.		5	6
W. A. Burbridge		2	6
P. Crees	1	0	0
E. Thompson	1	0	0
L. Packham		2	6
Red Sailor and Airman		5	0
Serviceman		10	0
A. Wall		5	0
M. Dooley		5	0
J. A. Campbell		2	0
H. Haycock		14	0
S. Clegg		6	0
R.O.F., South Wales		5	0
W. Morgan		13	0
A. McGeachan	1	6	0
Druzya Uchitiellya		17	6
D. E. P. Rees		10	0
L. Rhodes	1	0	0
Clifton D.G.		5	0
Boozy Bunch	2	5	6
Finchley D.G.		2	0
Much Overdue		10	0
Cleveleys D.G.	1	0	0
D. Shaw	1	0	0
E. M. Ruffell		3	0
Edinburgh D.G.		6	0
H. Levitt		10	0
A. D. Alexander		5	0
H. E. C.		10	0
W. Stuart		7	0
C. N. Craig	2	11	3
R. B. Sleep		2	6
G. Parsons		3	0
A. Bunting		3	0
N. Smith		2	0
J. McLean		2	6
R. Vinsome		3	0
B. Evans		7	0
M. Morris		1	0
Learner		2	0
E. Midgley		5	0
R. Oliver		1	0
C. Beresford		5	0
D. Halpern		15	0
C. Sharpe		2	0
F.Berry and G.Walters		4	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
F. Verulam	2	2	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
F. E. Stehr		5	0
G. P. Bugden		13	0
R. Carpenter		5	0
Smoke		10	0
S. E. Boatfield		3	0
Eric and Norah		10	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
G. A. E. Sargent		5	0
J. C. Underwood		3	0
F. W. Birchenough	1	0	0
E. C. Reckitt	5	0	0
V. R. Pearson		2	6
R. Morris		10	0
R. Frost		3	0
R. W. Palfreman		8	0
P. Pearman		2	6
R. Weare		3	0
J. L. Jolly		3	0
J. Rattray		2	6
D. Cass		5	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0
R. Jordan		3	0
P. Kay		3	0
Caxton Hall	2	10	0
W. McMurdo		10	0
Q. Z.		4	0
Radio Mech.,R.E.M.E.		3	0
L'Humanite		2	0
F. Overington		2	6
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
S. Mill		10	0
J. A. Smith		3	6
G. F. B.		10	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
R. J. F.		3	0
D. Finlay	3	0	0
Herts Reader		13	0
T. Williams		3	0
S. Joiner	1	0	0
J. E. Laws		1	0
C. J. Turner		10	6
F. M. R.		10	0
E. Storer		3	0
E. Morgan		3	0
D. Parvin		3	0
Cymro		3	0
J. L. Pinder		2	6
D. Gardner		2	0
Skegness D.G.		3	0
R. Anderson		7	6
Anon, Cricklewood		1	10
Penrith D.G.		10	0
N. Kelly		10	0
R.F.B.	3	0	0
A.T.S.		13	4
A. D. Alexander		2	6
G. K.		3	6
J. Bacon		4	0
Captain R.A.C.	1	0	0
Another Radio Mech., R.E.M.E.		10	0
A. C. O.		6	0
H. S. M.		2	6
R. Herring		3	0
A. & B. Muskett	1	0	0
W. E. Tucker		10	0
L. G. Phildius	2	1	0
W. F. Daltry		13	0

PROTECTED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S.S.R. SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

The four volumes in which Soviet experts described every aspect of life in the U.S.S.R., now re-issued as one volume, with a preface by Andrew Rothstein and the report which Voznesensky made to the 18th Conference of the C.P.S.U. (B.) on the economic progress and plans of the Soviet Union, in February, 1941—the eve of the German attack. Recommended by Board of Education for teachers.

Ready 6/- Shortly

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD

2, *Southampton Place, W.C.1*

A NEW LABOUR MONTHLY PAMPHLET

READY SHORTLY

Karl Marx — Political Foundations

by ROY PASCAL

Professor Pascal, whose KARL MARX—HIS APPRENTICESHIP TO POLITICS proved so acceptable as a Christmas Gift Book last year, has now written another pamphlet dealing with the life and work of the founder of scientific socialism a hundred years ago. 1843 was the year of Marx's marriage to Jenny von Westphalen, and the story of his life and the growth of his political thought is told in this new and vital pamphlet.

OBTAINABLE EVERYWHERE. PRICE 1/-.

Or direct from the Publishers—

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

They will also be pleased to send you a complete list of LABOUR MONTHLY publications.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED